THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

University of London
GURNEY
WOODSTOCK ST. W.

616921

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

OF THE

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

8 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CXCI.

COMPRISING PERIOD FROM THURSDAY, TWENTY-FIFTH DAY OF JUNE, 1908, TO WEDNESDAY, EIGHTH DAY OF JULY, 1908.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

1908.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_june-25-july-8-1908_191

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35	41	GEO. III.	1801
— 36	42	—	1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36	42	GEO. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44	GEO. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45	—	1805
— 6 & 7	46	—	1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47	GEO. III.	1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48	GEO. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49	—	1809
— 15 — 17	50	—	1810
— 18 — 20	51	—	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52	—	1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53	GEO. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54	—	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55	—	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56	—	1816
— 35 & 36	57	—	1817
— 37 — 38	58	—	1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59	GEO. III.	1819
— 41	60	—	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1	GEO. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2	—	1821
— 6 — 7	3	—	1822
— 8 — 9	4	—	1823
— 10 — 11	5	—	1824
— 12 — 13	6	—	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7	—	1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 16	7	GEO. IV.	1826
— 17	8	—	1827
— 18 & 19	9	—	1828
— 20 — 21	10	—	1829
— 22 to 25	11	—	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol.	1 to 3	1	Will. IV	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol.	4 to 8	2	Will. IV	1832
—	9 — 14	3	—	1831

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol.	15 to 20	4	Will. IV	1833
—	21 — 25	5	—	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol.	26 to 30	6	Will. IV	1835
—	31 — 35	7	—	1836
—	36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 —107	12	—	1849
—	108 —113	13	—	1850
—	114 —118	14	—	1851
—	119 —122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 —135	17	—	1854
—	136 —139	18	—	1855
—	140 —143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 —151	21	—	1858
—	152 —153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 —160	23	—	1860
—	161 —164	24	—	1861
—	165 —168	25	—	1862
—	169 —172	26	—	1863
—	173 —176	27	—	1864
—	177 —180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 —189	30	—	1867
—	190 —193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 —203	33	—	1870
—	204 —208	34	—	1871
—	209 —213	35	—	1872
—	214 —217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 —226	38	—	1875
—	227 —231	39	—	1876
—	232 —236	40	—	1877
—	237 —242	41	—	1878
—	243 —249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 —265	44	—	1881
—	266 —273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 —292	47	—	1884
—	293 —301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 —332	51	—	1888
—	333 —340	52	—	1889
—	341 —348	53	—	1890
—	349 —356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(Twenty-Eighth Parliament.)

Vol.	152 to 168	6	Edward VII.	1906
—	169 to 182	7	,, ,,	1907
—	183 to 191	8	,, ,,	1908

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

MR. ASQUITH'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION, APRIL 1908.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.
  Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
  Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.
  War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
  India Office——Rt. Hon. Lord Morley.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna, M.P.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most. Hon. Marquess of Ripon.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. Winston S. Churchill, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Viscount Wolverhampton.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.
The First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——Lord Fitzmaurice.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Herbert Samuel, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Colonel Seely, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——T. R. Buchanan, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Lord Lucas.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——George Whiteley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——T. McKinnon Wood, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Dr. Macnamara, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——Sir Hudson Kearley, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——C. F. G. Masterman, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——C. E. Hobhouse, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——F. D. Acland, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  J. A. Pease, Esq., M.P.
  Herbert Lewis, Esq., M.P.
  Captain Cecil Norton, M.P.
  J. H. Whitley, Esq., M.P.
  J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral of the Fleet Sir John Fisher.
  Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury.
  Rear-Admiral Sir H. B. Jackson.
  Rear-Admiral F. S. Inglefield.
Army Council——
  The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
  General Hon. Sir N. G. Lyttelton (Chief of the General Staff).
  General C. W. H. Douglas (Adjutant-General to the Forces).
  General Sir W. G. Nicholson (Quarter-Master-General to the Forces).
  Major-General C. F. Haddon (Master-General of the Ordnance).
  The Under Secretary of State for War.
  The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
  Secretary. The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. Ward).
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——George Lambert, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.
Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland)——T. W. Russell, Esq., M.P.
The Lord Advocate——Thomas Shaw, Esq., M.P.
Attorney-General——Sir W. S. Robson, M.P.
Solicitor-General——Sir S. T. Evans, M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Paymaster-General——R. K. Causton, Esq., M.P.
Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl Beauchamp.
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of Elibank, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir Edward Strachey, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount Althorp.
Vice-Chamberlain——J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of Granard.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of Manchester.
Lords-in-Waiting——
Earl Granville.
Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.
Lord Acton.
Lord Colebrooke.
Lord Suffield.
Lord Herschell.
Lord Farquhar.
Judge Advocate-General——T. Milvain, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. John Sinclair
Lord High Constable——Earl of Errol.
Lord Privy Seal——Marquess of Breadalbane, K.G.
Master of the Household——Duke of Argyll, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord Kinnaird.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of Montrose, K.T.
Lord Justice General——Rt. Hon. Lord Dunedin.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. Thomas Shaw, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord Kinsburgh, C.B.
Solicitor-General——Alexander Ure, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir Stair Agnew, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. Leach, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of Aberdeen, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir A. Macdonnell, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord Herschell and Walter Callan, Esq.
State Steward and Chamberlain——The Earl of Liverpool.
Controller——Lord Pirrie.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice Walker.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——Redmond Barry, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord Grenfell, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow, P.C.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq., K.C.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell ; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs) ; H. P. St. John, Esq. ; V. M. Biddulph, Esq. ; Hon. E. A. Stonor ; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq. ; C. Headlam, Esq. ; J. B. Hotham, Esq. ; E. C. Vigors, Esq. ; G. D. Luard, Esq. ; and G. Proby, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. Ambrey Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. C. E. Chizlett, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip, W. S. Wright, A. J. Vaughan.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. A. N. Stoll.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir H. F. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M.V.O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Assistant Shorthand Writer——William Gurney Angus, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. B. Gallop, H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. P. E. Ridge.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. W. Bradshaw.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The Chairman of Ways and Means——Rt. Hon. A. Emmott, M.P.
Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq., C.B.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——C. V. Frere, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq. ; S. L. Simeon, Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq. ; Horace West, Esq. ; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F. C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq. ; H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq. ; B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq. ; F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Junior Clerks——W. T. Legge, Esq. ; C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; W. P. Johnston, Esq. ; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour ; R. N. Bailey, Esq. ; G. F. M. Campion, Esq. ; S. De la Poer Beresford, Esq. ; H. S. Green, Esq. ; O. C. Williams, Esq. ; V. W. D. Fox, Esq. ; E. F. Wise, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. EDWARD GULLY, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——ERNEST MOON, Esq., K.C.
Trainbearer——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Messenger——Mr. W. HOLT.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
  Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
  Assistant Clerks——JOHN POYSER, Esq. ; W. K. SANDERSON, Esq.
  Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——V. KITTO, Esq ; Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART ; Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN and P. J. STOWELL.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Printers——
  Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
  Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq. (for H. M. Stationery Office.)
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G. NORMAN, J. SURRY, A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. INGLEFIELD and Mr. H. HAMBLING.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON, Mr. G. WAINWRIGHT, Mr. J. GUYATT, Mr. R. TURTLE.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY, W. MACDONALD, W. R. BRIMSON, A. NEW.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY ; Assistant——Mr. W. BROADBENT ; Porters——Messrs. J. HART and G. FRY.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CXCI.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 25TH JUNE, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

THE FURTHER STANDING ORDERS applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Tyne Improvement.

The same was ordered to lie upon the Table 1

Ards and Bangor Railways Bill.—(Petition for additional Provision).—Examiner's Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Wednesday next 1

River Wandle Protection Bill [H.L.].—Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1

North-East London Railway Bill; Bury and District Joint Water Board Bill.—Read 3^a, and passed 2

Honourable Artillery Company Bill [H.L.]; Tollemache Estate Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 2

Draycott Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 2

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.].—(No. 1 Order); Post Office Sites Bill [H.L.]; Doncaster Corporation Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, that the Lord Zouche of Haryngworth and the Lord Wynford be proposed to the House as Members of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of Lord Leigh and Lord Lochee; reda, and agreed to 2

London and District Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.], London Electric Supply Bill [H.L.], London (Westminster and Kensington) Electric Supply Companies Bill [H.L.].—Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over To-morrow 2

Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 1^a; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2^a (The Lord Denman, for the Lord Herschell), and reported from the Committeee. (No. 111) 3

June 25.]

Page

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.], Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3^{a} on Monday next 3

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^{a} (according to order); An Amendment made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 3

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Treaty Series No. 16 (1908).—Agreement between the United Kingdom and Spain respecting the Postal Service between Gibraltar and Spain 3

Trade Report (Annual Series).—No. 4013. Japan (Dairen (Dalney)); No. 4015. China (Hankow); No. 4043. United States (Consular District of Philadelphia); No. 4044. Hayti (Republics of Hayti and Santo Domingo); No. 4045. Spain (Consular District of Seville); No. 4046. France (Pondicherry and Karikal); No. 4047. Spain (Canary Islands); No. 4048. Italy (Province of Lecce).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 3

Civil List Pensions.—List of all pensions granted during the year ended 31st March, 1908, and payable under the provisions of Section 9 (1) of the Civil List Act, 1901 3

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Order made by the Leyton Urban District Council, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the urban district ... 4

Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1902.—Report by the Board of Trade respecting the applications to and proceedings of the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Act, 1882 to 1902, during the past year.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 4

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

The Earl of Mayo 4
The Marquess of Lansdowne 9
Lord Clonbrock 13
Lord Robertson 14
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) 16

On Question, agreed to,

Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Alverstone 18

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}.—(*Lord Alverstone*).

The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 20
Lord James of Hereford 21

On Question, Bill read 2^{a}, and committed to a Committe of the Whole House on Monday next.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE FUND.

The Earl of Donoughmore ... 23
Lord Denman ... 23

LOCAL TAXATION.—Order of Day read for resuming the debate on the Motion of the Earl of Onslow for Papers respecting the additional duties imposed by Parliament during recent years upon local authorities, and to the increased burdens thereby thrown upon the members and officials of county and other councils.

The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Viscount Wolverhampton) ... 25
Lord Belper ... 29
Lord Stanley of Alderley ... 35
Lord Zouche of Haryngworth ... 39
Viscount Midleton ... 40
The Earl of Crewe ... 44
The Earl of Onslow ... 47

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eight o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 25TH JUNE, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Cardiff Railway Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... 48

King's College, London (Transfer) Bill [LORDS] (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed with Amendments ... 48

Tawe Valley Gas Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments ... 48

London Port and Docks Bill (BY ORDER).—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn ... 48

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Monday next ... 48

Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—Read the first time; and ordered (under Section 9 of the Act) to be read a second time upon Monday, 6th July, and to be printed. [Bill 280] ... 48

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.—Reported with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow ... 49

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow ... 49

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow ... 49

June 25.] *Page*

Marriages Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.
Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 49

Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords]; Bristol Tramways Bill [Lords]. –Reported, without Amendment; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed ... 49

Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; Upton Town Hall Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 49

North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table 49

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 49

Private Bills (Group H).—Sir FREDERICK CAWLEY reported from the Committee on Group H of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve of the Clock.
Report to lie upon the Table 50

Railway Bills (Group 3).—Sir JOSEPH COMPTON-RICKETT reported from the Committee on Group 3 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Wednesday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.
Report to lie upon the Table 50

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords].
And, also, a Bill, intituled, Tollemache Estate Bill [Lords].

Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords]; Tollemache Estate Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 50

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table. 9 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 50

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899.—Order that the Paper relative thereto be printed, read, and discharged 52

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Order made by the Leyton Urban District Council; to lie upon the Table 52

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4013, 4015, and 4043 to 4048; to lie upon the Table... ... 52

Treaty Series (No. 16, 1908).—Agreement between the United Kingdom and Spain respecting the Postal Service between Gibraltar and Spain, to lie upon the Table 52

Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1902 (Proceedings).—Report respecting the Applications to and Proceedings of the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 198] 52

Page

Civil List Pensions.—List of all Pensions granted during the year ended 31st March, 1908, and payable under the provisions of Section 9 (1) of the Civil List Act, 1901, to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 199] ... 52

National Expenditure.—Return ordered, "of the gross income and outgo of the Government of the United Kingdom in the year 1906–7" 52

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Passages for Discharged Seamen from Continental Ports 52
Burns-Hartopp Estate, Kerry 53
Scottish Poor Rates 54
Maybery Estate, Kenmare 54
Coonina Pier, Kerry... 55
The Law Courts 55
Marble Arch Coffee Stall 55
Steamship "Helga"... 56
Grant for Irish Fishery Development 56
Cruisers for Irish Fishery Protection 57
Irish Afforestry Inspector 57
Import and Export Trade Statistics 57
Trawling in Sheephaven Bay 58
Limerick Competition 58
Unclaimed Property 59
Deptford Cattle Market 59
Imports of Foreign Cattle 60
Prices of Beef 60
Right of Speaking in Sheffield Public Parks 61
Manchester Education Conference 61
Cost of Supervising Sugar Factories 62
Collection of Licence Duties 62
Reorganization of the Revenue Service 63
Relief of the Unemployed 63
Proof Spirit in Cider 64
Unclaimed Bank Balances 64
Cost of Practice Ammunition at Glasgow 64
Fifteen Pounder Gun Shells 65
Artillery Practice—Efficiency Regulations 65
Territorial Artillery Officers 65
Boys at Woolwich Arsenal 66
Yeomanry Pay 66
Colonel Smythe's Collinstown Estate 66
Cahirciveen Evicted Tenant... 67
Irish Teacher's Pay 67
Irish Intermediate Education Board 67
Belfast Trams Committee's Report 68

June 25.] *Page*

American Gooseberry Mildew 68
Sheep Disease—Salving 69
Bolton Telegraphist's Grievance 69
Tobacco Manufacture Regulations... 70
Customs Duties on Hops 70
1st Argyll and Bute Volunteer Artillery 71
Bechuanaland Expedition Reward 71
Woolwich Arsenal—Compensation Case 72

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Fires on Admiralty Property 72
H.M.S. "Commonwealth" 73
Dockyard Employees and the Territorial Army 73
Aden Guard Ships 74
Returns of Naval Casualties 74
Cane Sugar Production 76
Disloyal Bengali Students 76
Calcutta Model Liquor Shops 77
Poppy Cultivation in China... 77
New Indian Press Law 78
Indian Frontier War Medals 79
Union of the West Indian Colonies 80
Dinizulu 80
Kingston Port 81
Employment of Ceylonese 81
Congo Trade—Native Rights 82
Russian Sugar Exports 83
Great Britain and Montenegro 84
Great Britain and Servia 85
The Khedive's Visit 85
The Ghezira Rebellion—Abdul Kader's Fate 86
Flogging Sentences in Egypt 86
The Fighting in Persia 87
Seizure of a British Subject by Moors at Tetuan... 89
Hamilton Spit Light 89
District Railway Carriage Doors 90
United Kingdom Pilots Association 90
Railway Rates for Beef 90
Central Unemployed Committee 91
Imported Skimmed Milk 92
Territorial Army Allowances for Substitutes 93
Early Morning Trains for Postal Employees 94
Unclaimed Deposits in Scotch Banks 94
School Attendance in Stornoway 95

Scottish Fisheries—Steam Propelled Vessels 95
Illegal Trawling—Gratuities for Fishermen 96
Prosecutions for Illegal Trawling—New Police Cruiser 96
Legislation for the Suppression of Illegal Trawling 96
Illegal Trawling by Foreigners 97
Tuberculosis Prevention in Scotland 97
Tooma Shooting Outrage 98
Ballymahon, County Longford, Riot 99
Outrage in Ireland in May 99
Assault on an Estate Inspector at Dundrum 100
Irish Proclaimed Counties 101
Judge Curran on Cattle-drives 101
Division of the Monaghan Estate Untenanted Lands 102
Irish Intermediate Education 102
Athenry Shooting Outrage 103
McCartie Estate, Headfort, County Kerry 104
Appeals under the Labourers (Ireland) Act 104
Knockanes (Kerry) Evicted Farm 105
Evictions in Ireland 106
Irish Excursion Train Incident 107
Belfast Hibernians' Excursion 108
Rathruddy Outrage 108
Ennis Cattle Outrage Claim 109
Gowel (Leitrim) Cattle Drive 109
Armagh Boycotting Case 110
Glensharrold Estate, Ardagh 110
Irish Mail Disputes 111
Discharge of Telegraph Messengers in Ireland 113
The Master of the Horse—Post Office Administration 113
Indian Reforms 114

Selection (Standing Committees).—Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection.
Reports to lie upon the Table 114

Companies Bill [Lords].—Read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 281] 116

NEW BILL.

Police County Authorities Bill.—To be read a second time upon Friday, 3rd July, and to be printed. [Bill 282] 116

Supply [13th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

June 25.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,600, be granted to His Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary for Scotland and Subordinate Office, Expenses under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, and Expenses under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, including a Grant in Aid of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Fund."

Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs) 117
Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.) 120
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 123
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 127
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 128

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,600, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.*)

Mr. A. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.) 137
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 147
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 157
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 167
Sir J. Dewar (Inverness) 171

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the Clock, and their being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further proceeding was postponed without Question put.

Oyster and Mussel Fishery (Bay of Firth) Order Confirmation Bill. [BY ORDER]—Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next, at a quarter past Eight of the Clock.

SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1908–9).

Postponed Proceeding on Question proposed on consideration of Question, "That a sum not exceeding £11,600, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the office of His Majesty's Secretary for Scotland and Subordinate Office, Expenses under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, and Expenses under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, including a Grant in Aid of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Fund."

Which Question was, "That a sum not exceeding £10,600, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson,*)—resumed.

Sir John Dewar 175
Mr. Wilkie (Dundee) 176
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 177
Mr. Ainsworth (Argyllshire) 183
Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs) 187
Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton)... 188
Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs) 189
The Solicitor-General for Scotland (Mr. Ure, Linlithgowshire) 192
Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) 194
The Lord-Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs)... 202

Page

Mr. EUGENE WASON rose in his place, and claimed to move, That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, "That a sum not exceeding £10,600 be granted for the said service."

The Committee divided; Ayes 52; Noes, 175. (Division List No. 138.)

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his report to the House.

Committee report progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

National Military Training Bill.– Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 213

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [LORDS]: Post Office (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords].—Ordered, that so much of the Lords Message [18th June] as relates to the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords], Post Office (Consolidation) Bill [Lords], and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords], be now considered.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Lords' Message considered accordingly.

Ordered, that a Select Committee of seven Members be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords, as mentioned in their Lordships' Message of 18th June, to consider the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords], Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords], and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords].

Committee accordingly nominated of—Mr. Beale, Mr. Cave, Mr. Arnold Herbert, Mr. Hills, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Solicitor-General, and Mr. Stewart Smith.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.

Ordered, "That a Message be sent to the Lords to acquaint them therewith, and to request that their Lordships will be pleased to add two Lords to the said Joint Committee."—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

SCOTTISH ESTIMATES.—On the Motion for adjournment,

Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.) 215
Mr. Williamson (Elgin and Nairn) 215
Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars) 216
Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) 216
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. J. A. Pease, Essex, Saffron Walden) 216

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 26TH JUNE, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Audenshaw Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed with Amendments... 217

Blackburn Corporation Bill; London United Tramways Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 217

June 26.] Page

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill; Marriages Provisional Order Bill.—Read the third time and passed 217

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next 217

PETITIONS.

Children Bill.—2 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 217

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill.—3 Petitions against; to lie upon the Table 217

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table ... 217

Licensing Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table. Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table 217

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 217

Port of London Bill.—Petition against, praying to be heard by counsel; to lie upon the Table 218

Public Health Officers Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table ... 218

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

National Guarantee for the War Risks of Shipping.—Report of the Committee appointed to consider a National Guarantee for the War Risks of Shipping; to lie upon the Table 218

Post Office (Changes in Wages, etc.).—Copies ordered, "of the Post Office Circulars announcing changes in the wages and conditions of service of Post Office Servants in connection with the Report of the Select Committee on Post Office Servants." 218

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Proceedings under the Land Purchase Acts 218

Pension of late Rector of Girls' High School, Glasgow 219

Cadets at Dartmouth, Osborne, and on Cruisers 220

Irish Education Grants 220

Introduction of the Agricultural Holdings and Small Holdings Consolidation Bills 221

Result of Labourers Act Inquiry at Dunfanaghy 221

Transfer of Officers of Disbanded Units 221

Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill.—Not amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 222

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 11, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'shall,' in page 1, line 17, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Cochrane (*Ayrshire, N.*) 223

Mr. Morton (*Sutherland*) 226

Major Anstruther-Gray (*St. Andrews Burghs*) 227

Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire) 227

Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) 228

Mr. C. B. Harmsworth (Worcestershire, Droitwich) 229

Mr. Carlisle (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 329

Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 230

Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 230

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.) ... 231

Sir F. Banbury 231

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir F. Banbury 232

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out the word 'may,' and insert the word 'shall,'"—(*Sir F. Banbury*), instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'may' stand part of the Bill.

Mr. Morton 232

Mr. Carlisle 233

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs) 233

Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College) 233

New clause—

"In the application of this Act to Scotland—(1) the expression 'local authority' means—(a) a county council, a town council, a parish council, a school board, and a district committee constituted under the Local Government (Scotland) Acts; (b) a central body and a distress committee under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905; (c) a joint committee or joint board or any other body constituted under the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, the Poor Law (Scotland) Act, 1845, and any Act amending the same, the Lunacy (Scotland) Acts, 1856 to 1900, or any other Act of Parliament or Provisional Order, and administering or entitled to administer funds derived from any rate; (2) the expression 'Local Government Board' means the Local Government Board for Scotland; (3) the definition of the expression 'local authority,' in Section 2 of this Act, shall not apply to Scotland,"—(*Mr. Gulland.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Mr. Carlisle 234

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause added to the Bill—

Sir F. Banbury 234

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 7, to insert the words 'as often as may be desirable at any meeting.'"—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) 235

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Masterman, West Ham, N.) 235

Mr. Carlisle 236

June 26.] Page

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Guinness (Bury St. Edmunds) 236

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the words 'two-thirds,' and to insert the words 'a majority.'"—(*Mr. Guinness.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'two-thirds' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Godfrey Baring (Isle of Wight) 237

Amendment agreed to.

Sir F. Banbury 237

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 14, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided also that it shall be lawful for such local authority to determine by a like majority that any matters discussed thereat shall not be published, and to provide by Standing Order, regulation, or otherwise, as may be approved by the Local Government Board, that any infringement of such resolution may be punished by exclusion of the person offending from future proceedings of the local authority for a period not exceeding three months.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 238
Sir F. Banbury 238
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 239
Mr. Arthur Henderson 239
Mr. Guinness 239
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 239
Mr. Watt 240
Mr. Masterman 240
Mr. Curran (Durham, Jarrow) 240
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 241

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Cave 241

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'regulations,' to insert the words 'as to the evidence to be furnished of the appointment of representatives of the Press and.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Arthur Henderson 242

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Winfrey (Norfolk, S.W.) 242

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 19, after the word 'representatives,' to insert the words 'direct or indirect.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Arthur Henderson 243
Mr. Masterman 243

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Winfrey 243

Page

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 20, after the word 'opinions,' to insert the words 'or on the ground of any reports or comments published by such newspaper.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Nannetti (Dublin, College Green) 243

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 20, after the word 'newspaper,' to insert the words 'or through the agency of such representatives.'"—(*Mr. Nannetti*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Arthur Henderson 244
Mr. Masterman 244

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Guinness 244

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 20, after the words last inserted, to insert the words "nothing in this Act shall prevent the exclusion of the representatives of any newspaper on the ground of the publication of confidential documents.'"—(*Mr. Guinness*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs) 245
Mr. Arthur Henderson 246
Mr. Masterman 246
Viscount Morpeth 246
Mr. Byles (Salford, N.) 247
Mr. Nannetti 248
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty (Dr. Macnamara, Camberwell, N.) 249
Mr. Rawlinson 250
Lord R. Cecil 252
Mr. Guinness 253
Mr. Masterman 954
Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch) 254
Sir Arthur Bignold (Wick Burghs) 254
Sir F. Banbury 255

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 20, after the words last inserted to insert the words 'Provided also that nothing in this Act shall prevent the exclusion pending satisfactory explanation of representatives of any newspaper on the ground of the publication of documents issued by the local authority to its members as private and confidential.'"—(*Mr. Guinness*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. C. B. Harmsworth 256
Mr. Staveley-Hill 256

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"To leave out the words 'pending satisfactory explanation,' and to insert the words 'for a period not exceeding three months,"—(*Mr. Staveley-Hill,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'pending satisfactory explanation' stand part of the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

Mr. Arthur Henderson ... 256
Mr. Dalziel ... 257

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Question put "That the words 'Provided also that nothing in this Act shall prevent the exclusion for a period not exceeding three months of representatives of any newspaper on the ground of the publication of documents issued by the local authority to its members as private and confidential' be inserted after the last Amendment made to the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 40; Noes, 164. (Division List No. 139.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 29, to leave out the words 'any newspaper,' and to insert the words 'the Press.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, to leave out the word 'it,' and to insert the word 'they.'"—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Masterman ... 259

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, at end, to add the words 'and no regulations in so far as they are so varied or altered shall be subsequently varied or rescinded by the local authority without the consent of the Board.'"—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Lamont (Buteshire) ... 260

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 1, after the word 'editor' to insert the words 'or the local representative.'"—(*Mr. Lamont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Carlile ... 261
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) ... 261
Mr. Byles ... 262
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) ... 262
Mr. Arthur Henderson ... 262
Mr. Stanley Wilson ... 263
Dr. Macnamara ... 263

Question put, and agreed to.

Sir F. Banbury ... 263

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 2, to leave out the words 'circulating in the district of the local authority.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Mr. Lamont ... 264

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 3, after the word 'notice,' to insert the words 'with agenda of the business.'"—(*Mr. Lamont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."
Mr. Guinness 264
Mr. Rees 264
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 264
Mr. Lamont 264

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, at end, to add the words 'and wilful neglect to do so on the part of such clerk or other officer shall be an offence punishable at summary jurisdiction by a fine not exceeding five pounds.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Masterman 265

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, to leave out subsection (*b*)."—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'an education committee' stand part of the Bill."
Sir Francis Powell... 266
Mr. Guinness 266
Mr. Byles 267
Sir William Anson 268
Mr. Radford (*Islington, E.*) 268
Lord R. Cecil 269
Mr. Masterman 270

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Winfrey 270

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'Committee' to insert the words 'and a joint education committee.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."
Viscount Morpeth 270
Lord R. Cecil 270

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 188; Noes, 48. (Division List No. 140.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, to leave out the words 'by a council.'"—*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Winfrey 273

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 17, to leave out from the word '1902' to end of line 20."—(*Mr. Winfrey*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."
Dr. Macnamara 273
Viscount Morpeth 274
Mr. Harmood-Banner (*Liverpool, Everton*) 274
Lord R. Cecil 275

Amendment negatived.

June 26.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 32, at end, to insert the words '(g) In the application of the Act to Ireland there shall be included boards of guardians, asylum committees, school attendance committees, and boards of any hospitals or infirmaries in receipt of a grant from public funds." '—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Lord R. Cecil 275
Mr. Carlile 276
Sir F. Banbury 276

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 1, after the word 'means,' to insert the words 'duly accredited.' "—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Nannetti 276

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out from the word 'means,' to the end of the clause, and to insert the word 'persons.' "—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'representatives of newspapers' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Guinness 277
Mr. Masterman 277

Amendment, by leave, withdawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, lines 2 and 3, to leave out the words 'circulating in the district of the local authority.' "—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 3, after the word 'newspaper,' to insert the words and of news agencies systematically carrying on the business of selling and supplying reports and information to newspapers.' "—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

Incest Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Mr. Rawlinson (*Cambridge University*) 278
Mr. Staveley-Hill (*Staffordshire, Kingswinford*) 281

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the end of page 1, line 12, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Maclean (*Bath*) 282
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland*) 283
Mr. Rees 284
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 285
Mr. Rawlinson 286
Mr. Lupton (*Lincolnshire, Sleaford*) 287

Page

Amendment negatived.

The Solicitor-General (*Sir S. Evans, Glamorganshire, Mid.*) 288

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, after the word 'is,' to insert the words 'alleged in the indictment.'"—(*Sir Samuel Evans.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Sir S. Evans 288

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 29, to leave out all words after the word 'over' down to the end of line 3, on page 2, in order to insert the words 'such female; and, if the offender is the guardian of such female, to remove the offender from such guardianship and in any such case to appoint any person or persons to be the guardian or guardians of such female during her minority or any less period.'"—(*Sir Samuel Evans.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill, put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Mr. Rawlinson 289

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, to leave out Clause 4."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Amendment negatived.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

And, it being Five of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Friday next.

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Proposed new clause—

"Any county council in Ireland may with the sanction of the Local Government Board for Ireland arrange to have the register of voters or any part of the register, prepared alphabetically in townlands or, as regards urban districts, in streets."—(*Mr. J. MacVeagh.*)—

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added to the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 14 and 15, to leave out the words 'within the meaning of the Redistribution of Seats Act, 1885,' and to insert the words 'or parliamentary division thereof.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 9, at the end, to insert the words '(1) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may make rules for adapting to the provisions of this Act, the enactments relating to the registration of electors in Ireland and the precepts and forms contained in or used under those enactments.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Objection being taken to further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next 290

Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill.—Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be read the third time upon Friday next ... 291

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection.

Reports to lie upon the Table 292

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at nine minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS, MONDAY, 29TH JUNE, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Law Guarantee Trust and Accident and United Legal Indemnity Insurance Societies Bill [H.L.].—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the Promotors do not intend to proceed further with the Bill; Order for the Second Reading To-morrow discharged: Ordered, that the Bill be not further proceeded with 293

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House 293

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House 293

Swinton and Mexbrough Gas Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 293

London County Council (General Powers) Bill, Manchester Corporation Bill, Widnes Corporation Bill, Tyne Improvement Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 25th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly, and committed; the Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 293

Leith Burgh Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons ... 293

Leicester Corporation Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 293

Bromley and Crays Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with Amendments; and passed and returned to the Commons 293

Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; King's College, London (Transfer) Bill [H.L.]; Audenshaw Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 293

Swansea Valley Gas Bill [H.L.], now Tawe Valley Gas Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 294

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.]; Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.]; Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.].—Message from the Commons that they have appointed a Committee to consist of Seven Members to join with the Committee appointed by this House, and to request this House to add two Lords to the Joint Committee. The said Message to be considered on Wednesday next 294

June 29.] Page

Board of Trade (Provisional Orders) Bill [H.L.].—Presented by the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 113] 294

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill. —Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Denman, for the Lord Herschell), and reported from the Committee. [No. 116] 294

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill.—[No. 117.]; Marriages Provisional Order Bill [No. 118.]—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners 294

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed and returned to the Commons 294

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 294

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Lunacy.—Sixty-second Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, 1908. ... 295

Trade Reports: Annual Series.—No. 4031. China (Kuikiang). 295

National Guarantee for the War Risks of Shipping.—Report of the Committee appointed to consider a national guarantee for the war risks of shipping; 295

India (Accounts and Estimates, 1908–9).—Explanatory Memorandum ... 295

Irish Land Commission.—Return of Advances.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie upon the Table 295

Factory and Workshop (Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries).—Regulations, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department for the process of the casting of brass; Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 295

NEW BILL.

Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) Bill [H.L.].—Presented by the Lord Avebury; read 1ª; to be printed, and read 2ª on Tuesday the 14th of July next. [No. 112] 295

Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill [No. 114]; Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill. [No. 115.]—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed 295

TREATMENT OF MERCHANT SEAMAN.

Lord Muskerry 296
The Lord Bishop of Bangor 306
Lord Ellenborough 309
Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 309
The Marquess of Salisbury... 311
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Lord Fitzmaurice*) ... 314

THE RE-TRIAL OF PRISONERS. Pag

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 315
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 316
Lord Alverstone 318

Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to Order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow 320

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 29TH JUNE, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—Tollemache Estate Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 320

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 320

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords]

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow 321

Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 321

Bristol Tramways Bill [Lords]; Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords].—Considered; to be read the third time 321

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway Bill [Lords]; Keighley Corporation Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords]; Northern Assurance Company Bill [Lords]; Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed ... 321

Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Read a second time, and committed... 321

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 321

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Wednesday ... 321

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to:—North-East London Railway Bill; Bury and District Joint Water Board Bill, without Amendment; Leicester Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill intituled, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, Leith Burgh Bill [Lords] 321

Page

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS]. -Read the first time; and ordered (under Section 9 of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 283]... 322

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [LORDS]. -Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 284] 322

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [LORDS]. Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 285]... 322

Leith Burgh Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 322

PETITIONS.

Licensing Bill.—2 Petitions against; to lie upon the Table. 2 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table... 322

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Irish Land Commission.—Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903; to lie upon the Table 323

Factory and Workshop Acts (Dangerous and Unhealthy Industries). Regulations made for the process of the casting of Brass; to lie upon the Table 323

East India (Accounts and Estimates, 1908-9).—Explanatory Memorandum, to lie upon the Table 323

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 4031; to lie upon the Table 323

Isle of Man.—Account presented, of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ended 31st March, 1908; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 196] 323

Destructive Insects and Pests Acts, 1877 and 1907.—Order, entitled the Destructive Insects and Pests Order of 1908; to lie upon the Table ... 323

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Lunacy.—Copy of Sixty-second Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 200] 323

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Shipping Masters at Antwerp 324
Regulations for Admittance to Training Colleges... 324
Statues on British Medical Association Building 325
Public Statues 325
Training Colleges for Women 326
Irish Primary Schools excluded from Supplementary Grant 326
Irish Universities Bill—Extern Students 327
Troops engaged in the Mohmand Expedition 327
Disturbances at Rathdowney (Queen's Co.) 328
Irish Labourers Provided with Allotments 328

June 29.] Page

Suggested Grant to John Gillen, late Royal Irish Rifles... 329
Civil Servants and Territorial Camps 329
Honours for Army Officers 329
Suez Canal Surplus Revenue 330
Notification of Births 331
New Class Assistant Clerks... 332
Thames-side Villages and Towns 333
Accidents at Portsmouth Dockyard—Medical Staff 333
Honours for Navy Officers 333
Adulteration of Flour with Talc 334
Applications for Small Holdings in Surrey 334
Cattle Driving in County Sligo 335
Greencastle Police and Travellers on Licensed Premises during Closed Hours... 336
Hours of Duty of Belfast Prison Officers 337
Reports on Schools in Circuit 8 (Belfast) 338
Portarlington Senior School Inspector 338
Irish Schools—Mr. MacMillan's Reports 338
Purchase of the Thompson Estate at Clonfin 339
Evicted Tenants' Applications sent in after May, 1907 339
Children Cuffe in Granard Workhouse 340
Applications for one year's Training from Irish School Teachers 340
Reinstatement of James Murphy of Croughtieri 341

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Contracts—Provision for Fair Wages 341
The Coastguard and the Summer Manœuvres 342
Disscussion of Naval Estimates 342
Naval Collisions 343
Middleburg Cantonments and Farms 344
Soldiers in Penal Servitude 344
Metropolitan Volunteer Permanent Staff 347
Cavalry Regiments for Scotland 347
Piershill Barracks 347
Mr. Churchill and the War Office 348
The Cardwell System 348
The Discontent in India 348
The Simla Scheme 349
Press Prosecutions in India 349
Southern Nigeria—Penalties in Gin 350
Sale of Spirits in Southern Nigeria 350
Spirit Smuggling into Northern Nigeria 351
Transvaal Mines—Native Death-rate 351
Australian Naval Defence 352
Asiatics in Rhodesia 353

Page
British Columbian Coastal Trade 353
Traffic in Arms at Muscat 354
Gun Running in the Persian Gulf 354
Arrest of Grimsby Trawler in German Waters 355
Brussels Sugar Convention 355
Foreign Legations at Teheran 356
Unclaimed Dividends 357
Old-age Pensions 359
Grant for the Unemployed 359
Metropolitan Police 360
Shipping Laws in the Channel Islands 360
Welsh Church Commission Reports 360
Dominoes in Public Houses 361
Railway Conference 362
Westerhope School Site 362
Milk Bill 363
Dangers of the Telephone 363
House of Commons Police 364
London University 364
St. Anne's Secondary School, Southampton 365
Education Code of Regulations 366
Small Holdings 366
Credit Banks for Small Holdings 368
Houses on Small Holdings 368
Appeals against Refusals of Small Holdings 368
Returns of applications 369
Equipment of Small Holdings 369
Small Holdings Act—Exercise of Powers under Clause 16 370
Small Holdings—Provision against Delay in the Preparation of Schemes ... 371
Strawberries on the Terrace 371
Education (Scotland) Bill 372
Bay of Firth Oyster Fisheries 372
Conviction of a Clyde Pilot 374
Poor Rates in the Lewis 375
Clonakilly Evicted Tenants 376
Glenflesk Evicted Tenant 376
Extra Police at Newry 376
Irish Education Grant 377
Greystones Harbour... 378
Army Estimates 379
Duration of Speeches 379
Sunday Trading 379
Scottish Estimates 380
Coal Mines (Eight Hours Bill) 380
Birthday Honours 389

June 29.] Page

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES.)—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection.

Report to lie upon the Table 380

NEW BILL.

Education of the Blind Bill.—To be read a second time upon Friday, 17th July, and to be printed. [Bill 286] 381

Old-age Pensions Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 3 :

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 381

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 10, to leave out the words 'such parochial or other' and to insert the word 'poor.'"—*(Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)*

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Lloyd-George 381

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause," put and negatived.

Question proposed, "That the word 'poor' be there inserted."

Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) 383

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"Before the word 'poor,' to insert the word 'indoor.'"—*(Mr. Bridgeman.)*

Question proposed, "That the word 'indoor' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

Mr. Lloyd-George 384
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 385
Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall) 387
Sir George White (Norfolk, N.W.)... 389
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 390
Mr. Lloyd-George 393
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 399
Mr. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 404
The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) 408
Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) 411
Mr. Goulding (Worcester) 412
Sir Walter Foster (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) 414
Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 416
Sir Francis Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 418
Sir E. Carson (Dublin University) 420
The Attorney-General (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) 421
Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.) 422
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Masterman, West Ham, N.) 423
Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley) 428
Sir Charles W. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 430

Page

Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.) 431
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 432
Mr. Price 433
Mr. George Roberts (Norwich) 434

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 317 ; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 141.)

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'indoor' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 142 ; Noes, 257. (Division List No. 142.)

Question, "That the word 'poor' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Goulding 443

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, after the word 'relief,' to insert the words 'owing to improvidence.'"—(*Mr. Goulding.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George 446
Mr. Walter Long 447
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 448
Mr. Rogers (Wiltshire, Devizes) 459
Mr. R. Duncan (Lancashire, Govan) 451
Sir J. Bethell (Essex, Romford) 451
Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle) 451
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 452
Mr. Lloyd-George 452
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 453
Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing) 455
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 456

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 62; Noes, 267. (Division List No. 143.)

Mr. Harcourt 461

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 11 and 12, to leave out the words 'as disqualifies for registration as a Parliamentary elector,' and insert the words '(other than relief excepted under this provision.)'"—(*Mr. Harcourt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir Charles W. Dilke 464
Mr. John Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) 464
The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) ... 466
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 467
Mr. Harcourt 467
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 468
Mr. Ramsay Macdonald 469
Lord R. Cecil 469
Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.) 470
Mr. Lloyd-George 470
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 471

June 29.] Page

Mr. Dickinson 471
Mr. Masterman 472
Mr. Walter Long 473
Mr. Lloyd-George 476
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 476

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 348 ; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 144.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 17th June, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, and on any questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day.

Amendments proposed—

"In page 2, line 15, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that for the purposes of this provision—(*a*) any medical or surgical assistance supplied by or on the recommendation of a medical officer ; or (*b*) any relief given to any person by means of the maintenance of any dependent of that person in any lunatic asylum, infirmary, or hospital ; or (*c*) any such relief as by law is not a disqualification for registration as a Parliamentary elector ; shall not be considered as poor relief.' "—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 17, to leave out from the word 'habitually,' to end of line 20, and to insert the words 'failed to work according to his ability, opportunity, and need, for the maintenance of himself and those legally dependent upon him. Provided that a person shall not be disqualified under this paragraph if he has continuously for ten years up to attaining the age of sixty, by means of payments to friendly, provident, or other societies, or trade unions, or other approved steps, made such provision against old age, sickness, infirmity, or want or loss of employment as may be recognised as proper provision for the purpose by regulations under this Act, and any such provision, when made by the husband in the case of a married couple living together, shall, as respects any right of the wife to a pension, be treated as provision made by the wife as well as by the husband.' "—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question proposed, "That the Amendment be made."

Mr. Austen Chamberlain 482

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 35 and 36, to leave out the words 'is convicted of any offence,' and insert the words 'having been convicted before any court is liable to have a detention order made against him under the Inebriates Act, 1898.' "—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 351 ; Noes, 89. (Division List, No. 145.)

Amendment made—

"In page 2, line 40, to leave out from the word 'direct,' to end of section."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question put, "That, the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Page

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 276; Noes, 158. (Division List, No. 146.)

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON (STATUTES).

Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 491

Attention called to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

House counted; and forty Members not being present—

The House was adjourned at half after Eleven of the Clock till To-morrow.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 30TH JUNE, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE FURTHER STANDING ORDERS applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Blackburn Corporation.

Also no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill.—Public Offices Sites (Extension).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 493

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (**Sevenoaks and Stourbridge Water Orders**); Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (Potteries, etc., Order).—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 493

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.] (**Bridgwater Order**); Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.] (No. 1 Order).—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 493

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (unopposed Orders); Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.] (unopposed Orders); Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.] (unopposed Order).—Reported, with Amendments 493

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (unopposed Orders).—Reported, with an Amendment 493

Wishaw Burgh Electricity, etc., Bill; Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [H.L.]; Garw and Ogmore Gas Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 493

Croydon and Southern District Tramways Bill [H.L.].—The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with 493

Fine Art and General Insurance Company Bill [H.L.].—The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. Order of the Day for the Second Reading read, and discharged. Ordered, that the Bill be not further proceeded with 494

June 30.] *Page*

Stockport Corporation Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Southwell District Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments: and passed, and returned to the Commons 494

Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill; Seaham Harbour Dock Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons 494

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. [No. 119] 494

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provision Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.].—Re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow ... 494

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Board of Education.—Minute of the Board, modifying the regulations applicable to schools for blind, deaf, defective, and epileptic children, 1907 [Cd. 3636.] 494

Trade Reports: Annual Series.—Nos. 4049, 4050.
Presented and ordered to lie upon the Table 494

Destructive Insects and Pests Acts, 1877 and 1907.—Order, entitled the Destructive Insects and Pests Order of 1908... 494

Public Works Loan Board.—Thirty-third Annual Report of the 495

Woods, Forests and Land Revenues.—Eighty-sixth Report.
Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 495

Post Office Sites Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 16th June discharged, and Bill committed ... 495

Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received To-morrow ... 495

THE IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.
The Earl of Donoughmore 495

Marriage Act (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.
Lord James of Hereford 495
Order discharged, and Bill, by leave, withdrawn.

Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill [H.L.].—Bill read 3ª (according to Order).
Lord Alverstone 496
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 497
Amendment made, and Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Chancellor 497

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Alverstone 498

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Lord Curzon of Kedleston 498

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers respecting the state of affairs on the frontier and in the interior of India."—(*The Lord Curzon of Kedleston.*)

The Secretary of State for India (*Viscount Morley of Blackburn*)... ... 520
The Earl of Cromer 533
Viscount Midleton 538
Lord Ampthill 544
Lord Courtney of Penwith 547
Lord Lamington 550
Lord Curzon of Kedleston 554

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at five minutes past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, TUESDAY, 30TH JUNE, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 556

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill; North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [Lords]; Upton Town Hall Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 556

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 556

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time; to be considered upon Thursday 557

STANDING ORDERS.—Resolutions reported from the Select Committee:—
Resolutions agreed to 557

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Bromley and Crays Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to:—Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; King's College, London (Transfer) Bill [Lords]; Audenshaw Urban District Council Bill [Lords], without Amendment 557

June 30.]

PETITIONS.

Children Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 557

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill.—2 Petitions against; to lie upon the Table. 3 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 557

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table ... 558

Licensing Bill.—2 Petitions against; to lie upon the Table. Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table. 8 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 558

Old-age Pensions Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table ... 558

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 558

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

University of London Act, 1898.—Paper to be printed. [No. 201]... ... 558

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4049, and 4050; to lie upon the Table... 558

Public Works Loan Board.—Copy presented, of Thirty-third Annual Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 202] 558

Woods, Forests and Land Revenues.—Eighty-sixth Report; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 203] 558

Board of Education.—Minute of the Board of Education, modifying the Regulations applicable to Schools for Blind, Deaf, Defective, and Epileptic Children, 1907; to lie upon the Table 559

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Assassination of an Indian Constable at Calcutta... 559

Restriction of Loans to Local Authorities... 559

Evicted Tenants Grievances 560

Purchase of Holding for B. Radford of Gurlienminogue 561

Annuities Collectable under the Land Purchase Acts 561

Consideration of Scottish Estimates 561

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve 562

Bomb Outrages at Calcutta 563

Government of India and the Franco-British Exhibition... 563

Indian Exhibits in the Franco-British Exhibition 564

Indian Press and the National Congress 564

Debate on the Indian Press Act 565

Mohmand Expedition Papers 565

Dinizulu 565

Hague Conference—Signature of the Convention 566

Insecurity at Salonika 566

Egyptian Special Tribunal Decree 567

The Vatican and the Irish Universities Bill 568

Page
Franco-Canadian Convention ... 568
Persia... ... 568
Imports of Arms into Muscat ... 569
Swansea Dock Fatality ... 570
Commonwealth Government of the Irish Trade Mark ... 571
Mall Improvement ... 571
Medical Attendance of Post Office Employees ... 573
Post Office Savings Bank—Unclaimed Balances ... 573
Remuneration of Sub-Postmasters—Commission on Bankers Postal Orders ... 574
Telephone Dangers ... 575
Employment of Half-Timers ... 576
Grants for Secondary Schools ... 576
Small Holdings Act—Dorchester (Oxfordshire) Inquiry ... 577
Small Holdings Act—Expenses ... 578
Small Holdings Act—Bishops Lydeard Inquiry ... 579
Small Holdings Act—Hours for Holding Inquiries ... 580
Somerset County Council—Small Holdings Committee ... 581
Grants to Sea Fisheries Committees ... 582
The Beef Trust and Deptford Cattle Market ... 582
Bolingbroke Hospital ... 583
Cost of Irish Administration ... 584
Irish Universities Bill ... 586
Cork Corporation Surcharges ... 587
Mr. Griffith's Ballintogher Estate ... 587
Irish University Bill... ... 588
Commission on Irish Bank Notes ... 588
Tied Trades ... 589
Government Contracts and the Fair Wages Clause ... 589
Income Tax ... 590

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection.

Report to lie upon the Table ... 590

Daylight Saving Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Special Report, brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 204.]

Bill, as amended, re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 287] ... 590

NEW BILL.

Bail Bill.—Presented by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 288] ... 591

June 30.] Page

Old Age Pensions Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT, (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 4.

Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire) 591

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'net.'" —(*Mr. Smeaton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'net' be there inserted."

The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. L. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) 591
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby)... 592
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 593
Mr. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 593
Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square) 593
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 594
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 594
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 595
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 596
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 597
Mr. Ellis Davies (Carnarvonshire, Eifion)... 598
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 599
Sir E. Carson (Dublin University)... 600
Mr. Asquith 600
Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.) 601
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 602
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) 602
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 602
Sir John Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth) 604
Mr. Smeaton 606

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 84; Noes, 310. (Division List No. 147.)

Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.) 609

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'unearned.'"—(*Mr. Chiozza Money.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'unearned' be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd George 611
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 611
Mr. William Rutherford 612

Question put, and negatived.

Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 613

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'receive,' to insert the words 'as of right.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George 614
Mr. Chaplin (Surrey, Wimbledon)... 617
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 618

The Attorney-General (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) 619
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 620
Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 622
Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam) 623
Lord Willoughby de Eresby (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) 623
Captain Craig (Down, E.) 625
Sir F. Banbury 626
Sir E. Carson 627
Sir W. Robson 627
Lord R. Cecil 627
Sir W. Robson 628
Mr. Rawlinson 628

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 134; Noes, 298. (Division List No. 148.)

Mr. Mildmay (Devonshire, Totnes) 633

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 7, after the word 'cash,' to insert the words 'excluding any sums of a less annual value than forty pounds received in consideration of previous contributions to a registered friendly society, or trade union, and.'"—(*Mr. Mildmay.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. L. Harcourt 636
Mr. Chaplin 637

Amendment proposed to the proposed amendment—

> "To add at the end the words 'provident or other society, or from such other approved provision against old age, sickness, or infirmity, as may be recognised as proper provision for this purpose by regulations under this act, and'"—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 640
Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) 641
Mr. Lloyd-George 642
Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 643
Mr. A. J. Balfour 643
Mr. Chaplin 644
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 644
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 645
Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley) 645
Mr. Maddison (Burnley) 646
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 646
Mr. Goulding (Worcester) 648
Mr. Lloyd-George 650
Mr. A. J. Balfour 652

Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

Question proposed, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

Mr. Austen Chamberlain 655
Mr. Lloyd-George 655
Mr. Jowett (Bradford, W.) 656

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 113; Noes, 243. (Division List No. 149.)

Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 659

Amendment proposed.

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'cash,' to insert the words 'excluding any sum not exceeding £26 5s. a year received from the Crown as a pension for services in the Imperial forces of the Crown.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George ... 662
Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 663
Captain Craig ... 664
Lord Balcarres ... 666
Mr. Ashley ... 667

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 68; Noes, 278. (Division List No. 150.)
Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 671

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'excluding,' to insert the words 'any sums payable as a premium of insurance against sickness, death, or funeral expenses, etc.'"—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed be there inserted."

The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) ... 672
Mr. Goulding ... 674
Captain Craig ... 675
Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 676
The Solicitor-General (*Sir S. Evans, Glamorganshire, Mid.*) ... 678
Sir E. Carson ... 678

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'excluding' to insert the words 'among other matters any sums payable as a premium of insurance against sickness, death, funeral expenses, and.'"—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Rawlinson ... 680
Mr. James Hope ... 680
Mr. Pike Pease (*Darlington*) ... 681

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 83; Noes, 298. (Division List No. 151.)

Mr. William Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*) ... 685

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 8, to leave out the word 'payable,' and insert the word 'receivable.'"—(*Mr. W. Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'payable' stand part of the clause."

Amendment agreed to.

Captain Craig ... 685

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 11, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'average.'"—(*Captain Craig*).

Question proposed "That the word 'average' be there inserted."
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 686

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Smeaton 686

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 16, to leave out subsection (*c*)."—(*Mr. Smeaton*).

Question proposed, "That subsection (*c*) stand part of the clause."

Mr. Lloyd-George 687
Mr. Walter Long 688
Mr. Jesse Collings 690
Mr. Lloyd-George 690

And, it being half-past Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 17th June, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That subsection (*c*) stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 327; Noes, 111. (Division List No. 152.)

The CHAIRMAN then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on the Amendments moved by the Government, on which notice had been given, and on any Questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 22, to leave out from the second word 'of,' to the end of line 25, and to insert the words 'a married couple living together in the same house, the means shall not in any case be taken to be a less amount than half the total means of the couple.'"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*).

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 378; Noes, 31. (Division List No. 153.)

Amendments proposed—

"In page 3, line 28, after the word 'pension,' to insert the words 'or for the receipt of an old-age pension at a higher rate than that to which he would otherwise be entitled.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 381; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 154.)

Clause 5.

Amendments made—

"In page 3, lines 31 and 32, to leave out the words 'shall be deemed to accrue from day to day, and.'"

"In page 3, line 33, after the word 'weekly,' to insert the words 'in advance.'"

"In page 4, line 1, to leave out subsection 3."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*).

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6 agreed to.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

London County Council (Money) Bill (BY ORDER)—Order for the Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 709
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 712

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Guinness (Bury St. Edmunds)... 713
Mr. B. S. Straus (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) 716

Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question," put, and agreed to.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

South-West Suburban Water Bill (BY ORDER).—Order for third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford) 717
Mr. John Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) 720

Amendment proposed.

"To leave out all the words after the word 'be,' and add the words 're-committed to the former Committee.'"—(*Mr Rutherford*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster) 722
Mr. Waterlow (Islington, W.) 723
Mr. Du Cros (Hastings) 725
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) 728

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and agreed to.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read third time, and passed.

And, it being half-past Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday evening, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at twenty-one minutes before One of the Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, WEDNESDAY, 1st JULY, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE FURTHER STANDING ORDERS applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Liverpool Corporation (General Powers). The same was ordered to lie on the Table 729

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—Report from.
Read, and agreed to.

Page

London County Council (Money) Bill; South West Surburban Water Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners ... 729

Educational Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, &c.) Bill [H.L.].—(Swansea Orders No. 1 and No. 2); London County Council (General Powers) Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Central Ireland Electric Power Bill; Widnes Corporation Bill; Tyne Improvement Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection that the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.: E. Stradbroke, V. Hutchinson (E. Donoughmore) chairman, L. Dunboyne, L. Elphinstone, L. Hindlip; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock; and all Petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills ... 729

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committees made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 729

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 730

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committees made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 730

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 730

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 730

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received To-morrow 730

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Trade Reports: Annual Returns.—No. 4020. No. 4051. No. 4053 to No. 4056 730

Colonies: Annual.—No. 562. Falkland Islands 730

Treaty Series, 1908.

No. 17. Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America, respecting the protection, preservation, and propagation of food fishes in the waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada.

No. 18. Treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States of America, respecting the demarcation of the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada 730

July 1.] Page

Wages Boards and Industrial Arbitration (Australia and New Zealand).—Report on the Wages Board and Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts of Australia and New Zealand 731

Shop Hours Act (Australia and New Zealand.)—Report on the Acts for the regulation of hours of employment in shops in Australia and New Zealand 731

Factory and Workshops.—Annual Report of Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, for the year.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 731

NEW BILL.

Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill [H.L.].—Presented by the Lord Steward (E. Beauchamp); read 1ª; to be printed, and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next. [No. 120] 731

Companies Consolidation Bill [H.L.]; Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.]; Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.].—Commons message considered (according to order). The Lord Balfour and the Lord Faber added to the Joint Committee; a Message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith, and to propose that the Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room A. on Wednesday next at Two o'clock 731

ACCIDENTS IN PORTSMOUTH HARBOUR.

Lord Muskerry 732
Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 732
Lord Ellenborough 734

THE POSITION OF THE MILITIA.

The Duke of Bedford 734
The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) 735

Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow 737

House adjourned at ten minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 1st JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Merthyr Tydfil Corporation Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 737

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 737

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment ... 737

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 737

Taff Vale Railway Bill [LORDS].—Reported with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 737

Page

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS—That they have agreed to:—Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill; Seaham Harbour Dock Bill, with an Amendment.

Stockport Corporation Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Southwell District Gas Bill, with Amendments.

"That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Criminal Appeal Act, 1907, with reference to the appointmen tof the Judges of the Court of Criminal Appeal and the appointment of a Deputy Registrar." [Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill [Lords]. 737

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords] Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords], and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords]. That they communicate that they have added two Lords to the Joint Committee appointed to consider the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords], Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords] and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords], as desired by this House, and propose that the said Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room A. on Wednesday next at Two of the Clock 738

PETITIONS.

Children Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 738

Licensing Bill.—Petitions against; to lie upon the Table. 18 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table... 738

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Report No. 562 (Falkland Islands) 1907; to lie upon the Table 738

Wages Boards and Industrial Arbitration (Australia and New Zealand).—Report on the Wages Boards and Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts of Australia and New Zealand; to lie upon the Table ... 739

Shop Hours Act (Australia and New Zealand).—Report on the Acts for the Regulation of Hours of Employment in Shops in Australia and New Zealand; to lie upon the Table 739

Factories and Workshops.—Report of the Chief Inspector for 1907; to lie upon the Table 739

Treaty Series (No. 17, 1908).—Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting Protection, Preservation, and Propagation of Food Fishes in the Waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada; to lie upon the Table 739

Treaty Series (No. 18, 1908).—Treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting the Demarcation of the International Boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada; to lie upon the Table 739

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4020, 4051, and 4053 to 4056; to lie upon the Table... ... 739

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Rules made by the Board of Trade; to lie upon the Table 739

Board of Education.—Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Elementary Schools; to lie upon the Table 740

July 1.] Page

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—Public Records (Treasury) (African Companies), Copy of Classes of Documents among the Records of the Royal African Company and the Company of Merchants Trading to Africa, which have been removed from the Office of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient Public value to justify their preservation therein 740

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Bristol Post Office Vacancies and Members of Postal Associations 740
His Majesty's Yacht "Victoria and Albert" 740
Coal Residues in Reinforced Concrete 741
Fishing—Foreshore Rights in Scotland 741
Alleged Assault of a Warder by Governor of Ayr Prison 743
Alnwick Post Office Drains... 743
Purchase of Inverhever Estate, Argyllshire 743
Service in Armed Forces of the Crown as Qualification for Old-Age Pensions ... 744
Establishment of a British Post Office at Jerusalem 744
Local Loans for Extension of Union Buildings 745
American Gooseberry Mildew 745
The Provincial Homes Investment Company 746

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Highflyer" 746
Debates on Navy Estimates... 747
Coastguardsmen in the Fleet 748
H.M.S. "Irresistible" 748
Sailor's Grog 748
Dockyard Territorials 749
Territorial Artillery Battery Adjutants 750
The Thakur Bahadur Singh 750
The Thakur Ram Singh 751
Transvaal Mines—Mortality among Labourers 753
British Honduras—Railway Project 753
British Guiana Militia 753
Crown Service and Old-Age Pensions 754
London Police Holidays 755
Regent Circus Flower Girls 755
Motor Vehicle Speeds 755
Vehicular Routes 756
The Women Suffragists 757
The Thames Conservancy—Public Rights on the Upper Thames 757
Nottingham Bankruptcy 762
Companies (Consolidation) Bill 762
British Patents—The New Act 763
Industrial Life in Germany—Price of Rye Bread... 764

Page
Speedometers on Tramways 765
Bay of Firth Oyster Fisheries 765
Insanitation at Stornoway 766
Highland Crofts and Deer Forests 767
Congestion in Lewis 767
Sutherland Main Roads 769
Old Shoremore Harbour 769
Embo Pier, Sutherlandshire 769
Port Skerra Pier, Sutherland 770
Illegal Trawling in the Moray Firth 770
Fishing Rights in Scotland 770
Clonakilty Evicted Tenants 771
Bustard Estate, Donegal 771
Carrick-on-Shannon Cattle-drive 772
Cattle-drives 773
Moate Cattle-drive 774
Dundrum Estate Cattle-drive 775
Foreign Office Vote 775
Sugar Convention Additional Act 775
The Navy Estimates 776
Scottish Estimates—Debate on Trawling 777
The Budget 777
Votes and Proceedings 778

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—Fifth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 779

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection.

Report to lie upon the Table 779

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill.—Reported without Amendment, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 205].

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 205].

Bill to be taken into consideration To-morrow 780

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the County of Pembroke, in the room of John Wynford Phillipps, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease*) ... 780

NEW BILL.

Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill.—Presented, to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 289] 780

Old-Age Pensions Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 7.

Mr. Bennett (Oxfordshire, Woodstock) 781

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 14, to leave out from the word 'determined' to end of the clause, and to insert the words 'by the pension officer.'"—(*Mr. Bennett.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, down to the end of line 14, stand part of the Question."

Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 783
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board (*Mr. Masterman, West Ham, N.*)... 789
Mr. Lyttelton (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 794
Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) 796
Mr. Bowles (*Lambeth, Norwood*) 800
Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (*Wiltshire, Chippenham*) 803
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 806
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) 807
Colonel Lockwood (*Essex, Epping*)... 808
Sir Charles W. Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 809
Mr. Samuel Roberts (*Sheffield, Ecclesall*) 811
Mr. George D. Faber (*York*) 812
Sir Maurice Levy (*Leicestershire, Loughborough*) 813
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 815
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs*) 817

Amendment negatived.

Sir Walter Foster (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) 824

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 16, to leave out the words 'local pension committee, and the committee,' and to insert the words 'stipendiary magistrate of the district or where there is no stipendiary magistrate to the County Court Judge within whose jurisdiction the claimant or pensioner resides who.'"—(*Sir Walter Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'local pension committee, and the committee,' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. Lloyd-George 825
Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) 825
Lord R. Cecil 826
Mr. Shackleton (*Lancashire, Clitheroe*) 828
Mr. Eugene Wason (*Clackmannan and Kinross*) 829
Mr. A. J. Balfour 829
Mr. Hugh Law (*Donegal, W.*) 830
Mr. Staveley-Hill (*Staffordshire, Kingswinford*) 830

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Hills (*Durham*) 831

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 16, to leave out the first word 'committee,' and insert the word 'authority.'"—(*Mr. Hills.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'committee' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Masterman 833
Lord R. Cecil 834

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord R. Cecil 834

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 16, after the word 'and' to insert the words 'except where such claim or question has been originated by the pension officer.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir W. Robson 835
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 835

Amendment, by leave withdrawn.

Sir Maurice Levy 835

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 17, after the word 'question' to insert the words 'and within three days of its receipt.'"—(*Sir Robert Levy.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George 836

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.
Mr. Smeaton 836

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 18, after the word 'officer' to insert the words 'with whom may be associated for the purpose of the inquiry such other person as the committee may appoint.'"—(*Mr. Smeaton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George 837
Lord R. Cecil 838
Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley) 839
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 839
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 840
Mr. Maddison (Burnley) 840

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 23, after the word 'information,' to insert the words 'from any other source.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 841
Lord R. Cecil 843
Mr. Lloyd-George 843
Mr. Bowles 844

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 24, after the word 'question,' to insert the words 'and after hearing the claimant, if requested to do so by him or thought desirable by the Committee.'"—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George 845
Lord R. Cecil 845
Mr. McArthur (Liverpool, Kirkdale) 847

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord R. Cecil 847

July 1.]

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 25, at the end, to insert the words, 'provided that a local pension committee may, and, if the committee refuse a pension, they shall, if required, state a case on any question of law arising as to the claim to a pension for the opinion of the high court, and the high court shall accordingly give its opinion thereon, and the local pension committee or central pension authority, as the case may be, shall determine such question in accordance with such opinion.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 850
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 851
Mr. Bowles ... 853
Mr. McArthur ... 854

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 46; Noes, 267. (Division List No. 155.)

Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.) ... 857

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 26, to leave out subsection (*c*), and insert the words '(*c*) The decision of the local pension committee allowing or refusing a claim for pension or determining any question referred to them shall, on the application of any person aggrieved, or the pension officer, be referred to the central pension authority, and shall be considered and determined by them.'"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, down to the end of line 26, stand part of the clause."

Mr. Lloyd-George ... 859
Sir F. Banbury ... 860
Mr. George Roberts (Norwich) ... 861
Mr. Adkins (Lancashire, Middleton) ... 861

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Walter Long ... 862
Sir F. Banbury ... 864
Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 866
Mr. Masterman ... 868
Lord R. Cecil ... 869

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 343; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 156.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 17th June, successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, and on any Questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day.

Question put, "That Clauses 8 and 9 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 330; Noes, 127. (Division List No. 157.)

Clause 10.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 31, after the word 'Board,' to insert the words 'and with the Postmaster-General (so far as relates to the Post Office).'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 363; Noes, 101. (Division List No. 158.)

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 360; Noes, 99. (Division List No. 159.)

Clause 11.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 30, to leave out the word 'municipal.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 358; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 160.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 41, to add at the end the words '(3) In the application of this Act to the Isles of Scilly, those isles shall be deemed to be a county and the council of those isles the council of a county."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 12 agreed to.

New Schedule:

Means of Pensioner.	Rate of Pension.
	s. d.
Where the yearly means of the pensioner as calculated under this Act—	
Do not exceed £21 - - - - - - - -	5 0
Exceed £21, but do not exceed £23 12s. 6d. - -	4 0
Exceed £23 12s. 6d., but do not exceed £26 5s. - -	3 0
Exceed £26 5s., but do not exceed £28 17s. 6d. - -	2 0
Exceed £28 17s. 6d., but do not exceed £31 10s. - -	1 0
Exceed £31 10s. - - - - - - - - -	No pension.

—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Schedule be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 328; Noes, 51. (Division List No. 161.)

Bill reported, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 290.]

Page

Married Women's Property Bill. Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next ... 899

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at ten minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 2ND JULY, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Crystal Palace Company Bill [H.L.]—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 901

Swansea Valley Gas Bill [H.L.]; now Tawe Valley Gas Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 901

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 901

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 901

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee without amendment, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next 901

Doncaster Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 901

Troon (Loch Braden) Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3ª on Monday next 901

Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 901

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next 901

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Board of Education.

Regulations for the training of teachers for elementary schools.
Code of regulations for public elementary schools in Wales.
Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table ... 902

Army.—Regulations for the Territorial Force and the County Associations ... 902

Census of Production Act, 1906.—Rules made by the Board of Trade. ... 902

Public Records (Treasury) (African Companies).—Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents among the records of the Royal African Company and the company of merchants trading to Africa, which have been removed from the office of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 902

Land Values (Scotland) Bill.—Amendments reported (according to order).
The Earl of Camperdown 902

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 18, after the word 'of,' to insert the word 'yearly.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 4, after the word 'separate,' to insert the word 'yearly.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 11, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'yearly.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Camperdown 903

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 26, to leave out from the word 'say' to the words 'Valuation Act' on page 4, line 5, and to insert the words 'yearly land value' means such part of the yearly rent or value of any lands or heritages as is fairly attributable to the land alone; (1) divested of buildings, erections, or improvements of whatever nature on, in, or under the soil, woods, fixed or attached machinery, and work of drainage and of reclamation, making up, levelling, and the like, where the benefit thereof is unexhausted at the time of valuation; and (2) subject to all building restrictions, servitudes, and contracts imposed thereon or existing in relation thereto. Provided that in the case of land proved to be required in the public interest at the time of valuation for building or industrial purposes, and to be unreasonably withheld from use for such purposes, the yearly land value shall be estimated as if such land were in use for the purposes aforesaid. Land shall not be deemed to be unreasonably withheld from use; (1) which is maintained as an open space or recreation ground; or (2) which is required for the amenity or convenience of a dwelling-house; or (3) which is required for the preservation of any buildings of historic or architectural interest; or (4) the maintenance of which in its existing condition is for the general advantage of the community. Provided further that where the assessor considers that any restriction, servitude, or contract created after the passing of this Act has been created in order to defeat this Act it shall be lawful for him (without prejudice to the appeal to which any person aggrieved is entitled) to disregard such restriction, servitude, or contract."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn) 907
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 911
The Marquess of Lansdowne 916
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Crewe) 920
Lord Stanley of Alderley 923

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," resolved in the negative.

The Earl of Camperdown 925

Amendment moved—

"To insert the words 'yearly land value' means such part of the yearly rent or value of any lands or heritages as is fairly attributable to the land alone, (1) divested of buildings, erections, or improvements of whatever nature, on, in, or under the soil, woods, fixed or attached machinery, and work of drainage and of reclamation, making up, levelling, and the like, where the benefit thereof is unexhausted at the time of valuation; and (2) subject to all building restrictions, servitudes, and contracts imposed thereon or existing in relation thereto. Provided that in the case of land proved to be required in the public interest at the time of valuation for building or industrial purposes, and to be unreasonably withheld from use for such purposes, the yearly land value shall be estimated as if such land were in use for the purposes aforesaid; Land shall not be deemed to be unreasonably withheld from use: (1) which is maintained as an open space or recreation ground; or (2) which is required for the amenity or convenience of a dwelling-house; or (3) which is required for the preservation of any buildings of historic or architectural interest: or (4) the maintenance of which in its existing condition is for the general advantage of the community.' "—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

The Lord Chancellor 926

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"To insert the words 'Provided further that where the assessors consider that any restriction, servitude, or contract created after the passing of this Act has been created in order to defeat this Act it shall be lawful for him (with-but prejudice to the appeal to which any person aggrieved is entitled) to disregard such restriction, servitude, or contract.' "—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 927

Amendment moved to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'the assessor considers' at the commencement of the proviso, and to insert the words 'it appears.' "—*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Amendment to the proposed Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'him,' and to insert the words 'the assessor.' "—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Consequential Amendment agreed to.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Bill to be read 3^{a} on Thursday next, and to be printed as amended. [No. 121.]

Commons Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 928

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Earl Carrington.*)

Lord Kenyon 929
Viscount St. Aldwyn 929

On Question, Bill read 2ª. and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

THE IRISH LAND ACT.

The Earl of Mayo 929
Lord Denman 929

Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order): An Amendment (Privilege) made; Bill passed and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Six o'clock till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 2ND JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Bristol Tramways Bill [Lords]; Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords.]—Read the third time, and passed without Amendment 931

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next... 931

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill.—Order [17th Febuary] that the Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill be committed, read, and discharged

Bill withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell*) 931

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table and to be printed 931

Private Bills (Group J).—Mr. PARTINGTON reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills; "That, for the convenience of parties concerned, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock."

Report to lie upon the Table 931

Private Bills (Group K).—Ordered, That Sydney Malkin do attend the Committee on Group K of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the Clock 932

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders Confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table 932

Bill read the third time To-morrow 932

Rochester Bridge Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 932

July 2]. *Page*

Holderness Water Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 932

Railways Bill (Group 4).—Mr. SOAMES reported from the Committee on Group 4 of Railway Bills; that for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 932

PETITIONS.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 932

Licensing Bill.—6 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table... 932

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Board of Education.—Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools in Wales; to lie upon the Table 932

Post Office (Changes in Wages, etc.)—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 206.] 932

Pensions (Civil List).—Order [18th June] far a Return relative thereto, read, and discharged; and instead thereof:—

Return ordered, "of all persons now in receipt of Civil List Pensions charged on the Consolidated Fund" 933

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Post Office Wages—Cost of Living at Dundee 933
Post Office Mails—Payments to Railway Companies 934
Motor Cabs in London 934
Revenue Statistics 935
Guaranteed Loans to the Colonies 935
Kilbrin Land Purchase Dispute 935
East Clonfert Evicted Tenants 937
Maghera Constables... 937
Belfast Police and Licence Holders 938
Admissions to Belfast Workhouse 939
Araglin Evicted Tenants 939
Teenan's Estate, Donegal 940
Irish Fee Fund Surplus 940
Dog Licences and Vivisection 941
Welsh Postal Pay 942
Unused Reply-Paid Telegrams 942
Education Waivers 942
Ballinclare Motor Fatality 943
University College, North Wales 943
Friendly Society Certificates of Thrift 944
Uganda Railway 944
Savings Banks and State Aid 944

Page

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Wireless Telegraphy 945
Naval Volunteers (Lands) Bill 946
Australian Commonwealth and the Navy 946
Fires on Government Property 947
Royal Irish Rifles 947
Manufacture of Scottish Tartans 948
Army Service Corps 949
Assam-Bengal Railway 949
Communications with Tibet... 949
Madras Landed Estates Bill 950
Cost of Protecting the British Legation at Teheran 950
Indentured Labour for Madagascar 950
Tristan d'Acunha 951
Nigeria—Land Alienation 951
Lagos Railway Lands 952
Sedition in Korea—Case of Mr. Bethell 952
Case of Mr. Luxenburg 953
Persian Unrest—British Legation Guards at Teheran 953
The Position at Tabriz 954
Martial Law in Persia—Employment of Russian Officers 954
Russian Tea Duties 954
Protestant Missions in the Congo Free State 955
Brussels Arms Conference 955
Russian Legation Guard at Teheran 956
Macedonian Agreement 957
Persian Refugees in the Teheran Consulate 957
The Reval Meeting 958
The Imprisoned Suffragists 958
Police and the Suffragist Raid 961
Church Army Midnight March 961
Motor Bus Fatalities... 962
Female Criminals 963
Chief Constables of County Police 963
Lead Poisoning at Tunstall 963
Miners (Eight Hours) Bill 964
The Patents Act 965
Unemployment 965
Westerhope School Site 966
Cash on Delivery in Morocco 967
British Post Office 968
Small Holdings Act—Schemes Submitted... 968
Small Holdings Act—Preliminary Inquiries 969

July 2.] Page

Small Holdings Act—Time of Holding Inquiries 970
Hollesley Bay Colony 970
Small Holdings Act—Purchase of Land in Excess of Demand 971
Co-operative Societies and Small Holdings 971
Loans to Jamaica 972
Industrial Spirits 972
Revenue Statistics 973
Old-Age Pensions Disqualification Clause 973
Civil Servants and Territorial Camps 974
Scottish Local Government Bill 974
New Fishery Cruiser for Scotland 974
Irish Education Grant 975
Cattle-drive on the Castlefrench Estate, Roscommon 977
Mulcair Lands, Limerick 977
Cloncurry Estate, Limerick... 978
Lord Inchiquin's Clare Estate 978
The Dublin Crown Jewels 979
Belfast Workhouse 980
Deportation of Paupers to Ireland 980
Deportation of Paupers to and from Belfast 981
Women and the King's Scholarship Examination 982
Queen's College, Ireland—Status of Professors 983
Irish Congested Districts Board 984
Strangford Bar Whistling Buoy 984
The Autumn Sitting of Parliament 984
Wholesale Wine and Spirit Merchants' Licences 985
Franchise Reform 985
Old-age Pensions Bill 985
Business of the House 986

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords]; and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords].—Ordered, "That so much of the Lords Message of 1st July as relates to the time and place of meeting of the Joint Committee on the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords], Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords], and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords], be now considered."—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Lords Message considered accordingly.

Ordered, "That the Committee of this House do meet the Lords Committee as proposed by their Lordships."

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease*) 987

Children Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee B.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 207.]

Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 207.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 291] 987

Page

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection.

Report to lie upon the Table 988

NEW BILLS.

Teachers of Music Registration Bill.—To be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 292] 988

Local Government (Ireland) Bill.—To be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 293] 988

SUPPLY [14TH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, AND SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1908–9.

CLASS IV.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £114,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Expenses of the Commissoners of National Education in Ireland."

Mr. Hazleton (Galway, N.) 989

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £113,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Hazleton.*)

Mr. J. Murphy (Kerry, E.) 995
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1003
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 1007
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) 1014
Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.) 1018
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 1024
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 1025
Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University) 1028
Mr. Healy (Louth, N.) 1031
Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 1035
Mr. Murnaghan (Tyrone, Mid.) 1038
Mr. Sloan (Belfast, W.) 1042
Mr. Harrington (Dublin Harbour) 1046
Mr. Lardner (Monaghan, N.) 1047
Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan) 1049
Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.) 1050
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 1051
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1060
Mr. Walter Long 1074
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.) ... 1076
Mr. T. M. Healy 1077
Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 1078
Mr. Byles (Salford, N.) 1078
Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.) 1079

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

£670,818, to complete the sum for Public Education, Ireland.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Mr. Muldoon (*Wicklow, E.*) 1080

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the Motion for the Adjournment of the House lapsed without Question put.

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill.—Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; Bill read the third time, and passed 1080

Urban District Councils (Advertising) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged 1080

Bill withdrawn.

Adjourned at two minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 3RD JULY, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH.—Leith Burgh Bill [Lords]. Wath and Bolton Gas Board Bill [LORDS].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 1081

Blaydon and Ryton Water (Transfer) Bill; Bromley and Crays Gas Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1081

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1081

North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 1081

Upton Town Hall Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1081

Briton Ferry Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1081

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1081

PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table ... 1081

Licensing Bill.—5 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 1082

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1082

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Army (Territorial Force).—Regulations for the Territorial Force and the County Associations, 1908; to lie upon the Table 1082

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act, 1907.—Return giving particulars of cases in which persons have been reinstated with the assistance of the Estates Commissioners; to lie upon the Table 1082

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Parliamentary Voters 1082
Post Office Clerks—Hours of Attendance 1083
Promotion of Post Office Linesmen... 1083
Vaccination of Postal Employees 1084
Scottish Fishery Board—Fees and Expenses 1084
Treatment of Glanders 1085
Migration of Isle of Lewis Cottars 1085
Imports of Foreign Malt 1086
Irish School Rules for Teachers 1086
Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants on the Grehan Estates 1087
Dairies, Cowsheds and Milkshops (Ireland) Order, 1908 1088
Payment of Irish Education Grants 1089

Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill.—Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1089

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Incest Bill.—Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [26th June], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed 1090

Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill.—Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Sir F. Banbury 1090
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1091

Amendment proposed to the Bill.

"In page 1, line 13, after the word 'thereof' to insert the words 'provided that the local authority, within the meaning of the same section in the City of London, shall be the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.'"—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch) 1091
Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.) 1091
Mr. Guinness (Bury St. Edmunds) 1094
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 1095

Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 1096
Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.) 1097
Sir F. Banbury 1098
Mr. Guinness 1099

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 26; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 162.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be read the third time."

Sir F. Banbury 1100

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Police Superannuation Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Bill read the third time, and passed 1101

Law of Distress Amendment Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Mr. Rawlinson 1101
Mr. Staveley-Hill (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) 1103

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'lodger,' in line 8, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) 1103

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Rawlinson 1105

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, after the word 'any,' to insert the words 'bill of sale, hire purchase agreement, or.' "—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read the third time."

The Solicitor-General (Sir S. Evans, Glamorganshire, Mid.) 1105
Sir F. Banbury 1105

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

Sir F. Banbury 1106

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out from the word 'where' to the word 'a,' in line 6, and to insert the words 'a Court of summary jurisdiction is satisfied by evidence produced before it that.' "—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Page

Mr. Mooney (Newry) 1108
Mr. Godfrey Baring (Isle of Wight) 1109
Sir F. Banbury 1109
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) 1109
Mr. Luttrell (Devonshire, Tavistock) 1109
Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) 1109
Mr. Mooney 1110

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted in the Bill.

Sir F. Banbury 1110

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out from the word 'her,' to the word 'with' in line 13.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Mooney 1110

Amendment agreed to.

Sir F. Banbury 1111

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, to leave out from the third word 'or' to the word 'the' in page 2, line 2."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Luttrell 1112
Mr. James Campbell 1112
Mr. Mooney 1112
Mr. Hazleton (Galway, N.) 1113
The Solicitor-General for Ireland (Mr. Redmond Barry, Tyrone, N.) ... 1113
Mr. Sloan 1114
Sir F. Banbury 1114

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 116; Noes, 23. (Division List No. 163.)

Sir F. Banbury 1115

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the words 'acting by the direction of the board of guardians.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Redmond Barry 1115

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, to leave out from the word 'where' to the word 'a' in line 6, and to insert the words 'a Court of summary jurisdiction is satisfied by evidence produced before it that.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 9, after the words 'of any person,' to insert the word 'or.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question, "That the word 'or' be there inserted," put, and negatived.

Sir F. Banbury ... 1116
Mr. Mooney ... 1116

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, to leave out the words 'or thing.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or thing' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Redmond Barry ... 1117
Mr. Staveley-Hill ... 1117
Mr. Sloan ... 1118
Mr. Hazleton ... 1118

Question put, "That the words 'or thing' stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 124; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 134)

Sir F. Banbury ... 1119

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 21, to leave out the words 'appears to be thought to be,' and insert the word 'is.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. James Campbell ... 1119
Mr. Mooney ... 1119

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of Clause 11, to add the words 'Provided always that no person shall be liable to be convicted under this section unless the Court is satisfied that he knew or ought to have known the condition of the person in connection with whom the charge is brought.'"—(*Mr. James Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln) ... 1121
Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.) ... 1121
Mr. Redmond Barry ... 1121
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) ... 1121
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) ... 1122
Mr. Hazleton ... 1122
Sir F. Banbury ... 1123
Viscount Morpeth (Birmingham, S.) ... 1123
Mr. Guy Baring (Winchester) ... 1123
Mr. James Campbell ... 1123
Mr. Sloan ... 1124

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Rawlinson ... 1124
Mr. Mooney ... 1125

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 8, to omit the words 'and save when a defendant a compellable.'"—(*Mr Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Redmond Barry 1125

Amendment agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

Sir F. Banbury 1126

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Education (Local Authorities) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. McKinnon Wood, Glasgow, St. Rollox) 1126

New Clause—

"To add the following clause: 'For the purpose of establishing or maintaining any school or college which any council have power to establish or maintain under Part II. of the Education Act, 1902, the council may agree to unite with any other council having powers under that Part of that Act, upon such terms as to payment, the appointment of a joint body of managers, and otherwise, as may be thought proper.'"—(*Mr. McKinnon Wood.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 1127
Mr. Walker (Leicestershire, Melton) 1129
Viscount Morpeth (Birmingham, S.) 1129
Mr. Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) 1130
Lord R. Cecil 1131
Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) 1133
Mr. McKinnon Wood 1133
Sir F. Banbury 1134
Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield) 1135
Mr. Rees 1135
Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) 1136
Mr. Adkins (Lancashire, Middleton) 1137
Mr. Rawlinson 1138
Mr. McKinnon Wood 1140
Mr. Godfrey Baring 1140
Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, W.R., Thirsk) 1140

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 153 ; Noes, 40. (Division List No. 165).

Clause read a second time.

Mr. Godfrey Baring 1143
Lord Balcarres 1143

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 4, after the word 'payment,' to insert the words 'and audit.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. McKinnon Wood 1143

And, it being Five of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Wednesday next.

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill.—Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment [26th June] proposed on consideration of the Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee).

Which Amendment was—

"In page 2, line 9, at the end, to insert the words '(1) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may make rules for adapting to the provisions of this Act the enactments relating to the registration of electors in Ireland, and the precepts and forms contained in or used under those enactments.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, to leave out from the word 'effect' to end of subsection."—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed 1143

Coroners' Inquests Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next 1144

Daylight Saving (Re-committed) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next 1144

Handloom Weaving (Ireland) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee 1144

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection.

Report to lie upon the Table 1144

Private Bills (Group K).—Sir GEORGE WHITE reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties concerned, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1144

Ards and Bangor Railways Bill.—Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1144

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at five minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 6TH JULY, 1908.

VISCOUNT BOYNE.—Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Gustavus William, Viscount Boyne in the Peerage of Ireland, to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. 1145

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

THE STANDING ORDERS applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—London County Council (Money).

Also no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11).

And also the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—South-West Suburban Water.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1145

Blackburn Corporation Bill; Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 25th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^a; agreed to.

Bills read 2^a accordingly 1145

Finchley Urban District Council Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons ... 1145

Motherwell Burgh Extension, etc., Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1145

Blackburn Corporation Bill.—Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1146

Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill.—Committed 1146

Widnes Corporation Bill.—The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn; The Orders made on Monday and Wednesday last discharged, and Bill committed 1146

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^a, and referred to the Examiners 1146

Bristol Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Cambrian Railways Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 1146

North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment: The said Amendment considered, and agreed to 1146

Upton Town Hall Bill [H.L].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1146

Blaydon and Ryton Water (Transfer) Bill; Bromley and Crays Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1146

London and District Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.].—King's Consent and Consent of the Prince of Wales, signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 1146

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read 1^a; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. [No. 130] 1146

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3^a To-morrow 1146

July 6.] *Page*

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]; Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order) and passed, and sent to the Commons 1147

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1147

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 1147

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill; River Wandle Protection Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [H.L.].—(Swansea Orders, No. 1 and No. 2), and other Bills do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill, the Blackburn Corporation Bill, and the River Wandle Protection Bill [H.L.]; read and agreed to. All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the Petitioners praying to be heard by Counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also Counsel for the Bills 1147

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Treaty Series, No. 19. (1908).—Notes exchanged between the United Kingdom and Sweden and Norway, relative to the Agreement of 12th July, 1881, for the mutual relief of distressed seamen 1147

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act, 1907.—Return giving particulars of cases in which persons have been reinstated 1147

Irish Land Commission.—Return of advances

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

Post Office Savings Bank.—Accounts of all deposits received and paid and the nature and amount of the securities held by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to meet those liabilities at that date ... 1148

Building Societies.—Thirteenth Annual Report by the Chief Registar of Friendly Societies of the proceedings of the Registrars under the Building Societies Acts, Part I. Report 1148

Friendly Societies, Workmen's Compensation Schemes, Industrial and Provident Societies and Trade Unions.—Reports of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies for the year ended 31st December, 1907. Part A.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1148

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.]; Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.]; Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.].—Message from the Commons that they have ordered that the Select Committee appointed by them to join with a Committee of this House to consider the said Bills do meet the Committee appointed by their Lordships in Committee Room A, upon Wednesday next, at Two o'clock, as proposed by this House 1148

Page

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill (No. 122); Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill (No. 123).—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed 1149

Incest Bill (No. 124); Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill (No. 125); Police (Superannuation) Bill (No. 126); Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill (No. 127); Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill (No. 128).—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed 1149

Law of Distress Amendment Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday, the 14th instant. [No. 129] 1149

Missing British Ships.

Lord Muskerry 1149

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in every case where a British ship is posted as missing and given up as lost, a public investigation should, when practicable, be ordered by the Board of Trade in order, if possible, to elicit any material facts which might tend to throw light on the probable cause of the disaster."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 1149
Lord Ellenborough 1156
The Marquess of Salisbury 1157
The Earl of Meath 1159
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1160
The Earl of Halsbury 1162
Lord Muskerry 1162

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Horses for the Army.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1163

Moved, "For papers relating to the question of the provision of horses for military purposes."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

Lord Ribblesdale 1169
The Earl of Errol 1172
Lord Lovat 1176
The Earl of Onslow 1177
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 1179
The Earl of Donoughmore 1188

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Nurses Registration Bill. [Second Reading.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Ampthill 1188

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

Lord Kinnaird 1197
The Earl of Crewe 1197
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1201
Lord Stanley of Alderley 1203

Moved, "That the debate be adjourned."—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

Lord Ampthill 1203
The Earl of Mayo 1204

Motion for the adjournment, by leave, withdrawn.

On Question, original Motion agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Appelate Jurisdiction Bill [H.L.]—House in Committee (according to Order). An Amendment made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendment to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. [No. 131] 1204

Commons Bill [H.L.]—Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read and discharged 1204

House adjourned at Five minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 6TH JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill; Seaham Harbour Dock Bill; Southwell District Gas Bill; Stockport Corporation Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1205

Merthyr Tydvil Corporation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1205

Bristol Corporation Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered: to be read the third time 1205

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords]; Tollemache Estate Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 1205

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1205

Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Wednesday ... 1205

Private Bills (Group J).—Mr. PARTINGTON reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Wednesday next at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1205

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to: Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.

Amendments to:—Swansea Valley Gas Bill [Lords], now Tawe Valley Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, Piers and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords] 1205

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 296] 1206

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 297]... 1207

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 298] 1207

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 299] 1207

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time: referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 300] 1207

Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; and ordered (under Section 9 of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 301] 1207

PETITIONS.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill.—23 Petitions against; to lie upon the Table 1207

Licensing Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table. Petition against alteration of Clause 20; to lie upon the Table. Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1207

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1207

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table... 1208

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Naval Prize Money.—Account presented, showing the Receipt and Expenditure of Naval Prize Bounty, Salvage and other Moneys; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 208] 1208

Irish Land Commission.—Return of Advances; to lie upon the Table ... 1208

Treaty Series (No. 19, 1908).—Note exchanged between the United Kingdom and Sweden and Norway relative to the Agreement of 12th July, 1881, for the Mutual Relief of Distressed Seamen; to lie upon the Table 1208

Post Office Savings Banks.—Accounts presented, of all Deposits received and paid and the nature and amount of the Securities held by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to meet those Liabilities at that date; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 209]... 1208

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Friendly Societies, Workmen's Compensation Schemes, Industrial and Provident Societies, and Trade Unions, Reports of the Chief Registrar for the year; to be printed. [No. 210.]

Building Societies, Copy of Thirteenth Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the Proceedings of the Registrar under the Building Societies Acts, etc., to be printed. [No. 211]... 1208

July 6.] Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

English Historical Monuments—Suggested Royal Commission... 1209
Post Office Charge, Clerks in North of Ireland 1209
The Superannuation (Post Office and War Office) Act, 1876 1209
Scottish Judges as Bank Directors... 1210
Reduction of the Sinking Fund 1211
The Bank of Ireland Directors 1211
Restoration of Evicted Tenants on the Tredennick Estate 1212
Police at Public Meetings at Killmurray 1213
Congested Districts Board—Amount spent on Wages 1213
Drainage of the River Robe... 1213
Restoration of Evicted Tenants in County Kerry... 1214
Irish Primary Education Grants 1214
The Canadian Militia and the Ross Rifle 1214
The Harvester Excise Act in Australia 1215
Split Duties in Hull Post Office 1216
Thursday Evening Postal Delivery at Banchory 1216
Post Office Territorials and Camp Leave 1217
Prevention of Tramcar Accidents 1217
Irish Trade Statistics 1218
Compulsory Attendance at Church of School Children at Wheatley (Oxon) ... 1218
Grants for Higher Education in Ireland 1219
County of London Pensions Committee 1219
Irish Agricultural Holdings 1219
Restoration of County Longford Evicted Tenants 1220
Grants for Scholarships in Ireland 1221
Training of Irish Teachers 1222
Disposal of Unallotted Portions of the Claremount Lands 1222
Evicted Tenants—Claim of John D. M'Auliffe 1222
Grants to Irish Intermediate Education Board from Surplus Duty on Intoxicating Drinks 1222

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Expenditure on Coal 1224
Southampton County Association's Recruiting Circular 1224
Volunteer Long-Service Medal 1225
Dockyard Territorials 1226
The Territorial Force Returns 1227
Woolwich Arsenal 1228
Woolwich Arsenal Inquest 1229
New Cavalry Sword 1230
Supposed Foreign Spies in England 1230
War Office Coal Purchases 1232
The Special Reserve 1232

Page
Strength of Infantry of the Line 1233
Artillery Statistics 1234
Establishment of Line Battalions 1234
War Office, Salisbury Plain Estate and Small Holdings 1235
Public Servants and the Territorial Camps 1235
Transvaal Gold Law... 1236
Migration of Boers 1236
Transvaal Native Land and Tax Bills 1237
The French Tariff 1237
United States Head Tax on British Travellers 1238
Unclaimed Dividends 1238
Old-age Pensions 1239
Pay for Extra Police Duty 1240
Fairfield Shipbuilding Company, Govan—Employment of Young Persons ... 1240
Bishop of London's Midnight March 1241
Prison Treatment of Suffragists 1243
Taxicab Speed 1244
Lights on Vehicles 1245
The London Police Commission 1245
Price of Bread in Germany 1247
Railway Companies and Cyclists 1247
British and German Savings 1248
Daylight Saving Bill 1248
Report on Wages and Prices in Germany... 1249
Unemployed Act, 1905 1250
Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill... 1251
Telephone Mouthpieces 1251
Medical Inspection of Children 1251
School Object-Lessons 1253
Hyde Park Carriage Entrances 1254
Girl Clerks in the Post Office 1255
Boy Clerks in the Civil Service 1255
Public Trustee and Stockbrokers' Commission 1256
The South Western District Coroner 1257
Clyde Pilots' Grievance 1257
Trawling in the Moray Firth 1258
Irish Banknotes 1258
Board of Trade Vote 1259
Royal Commissson on the Poor Law 1260
The Unemployed Grant 1260

Coroners (Ireland) Bill.—Reported, with an Amendment, from Standing Committee A.
Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 212.]
Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 212.]
Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee) to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 294] 1260

HOP INDUSTRY.—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 213] 1261

Business of the House (Old-age Pensions Bill.)—Ordered, That the proceedings on the Old-age Pensions Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House).—(*Mr. Asquith.*) 1261

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [22nd June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. James Mason*).

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) 1261
The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 1271
Mr. Beck (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech) 1279
Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1281
Mr. Osmond Williams (Merionethshire) 1288
Mr. Parkes (Birmingham, Central) 1290
Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) 1296
Mr. Hemmerde (Denbighshire, E.) 1302
Sir Charles McLaren (Leicestershire, Bosworth) 1307
Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich) 1310
The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Churchill, Dundee) 1325

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 390; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 166.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 113; Noes, 391. (Division List No. 167.)

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

Old-age Pensions Bill.—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1343

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of the Schedule and in respect of the Amendments to paragraphs (i.) and (ii.) of the proviso to paragraph (*a*) of Clause 3, standing on the Notice Paper in the name of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer as Amendments to be moved on re-committal."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 1345

Amendment proposed.—

"In line 2, after the first word 'of,' to insert the words 'Clause 2 and.'"—(*Mr. Carlile.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Page
Mr. Lloyd-George 1346
Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) 1346
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1348
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 1349
Mr. Curran (Durham, Jarrow) 1350
Mr. Goulding (Worcester) 1351
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) 1351
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1352
Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.) 1354
Sir John Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth) 1354
Mr. Robert Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan) 1355
Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn) 1356
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 1357
Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing) 1358
Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth) 1359

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 50; Noes, 302. (Division List No. 168.)

Lord R. Cecil 1363
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1367

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the first word 'of,' to insert the words 'Clause 3 and.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George 1368
Mr. Walter Long 1369

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 72; Noes, 337. (Division List No. 169.)

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. ASQUITH rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 334; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 170.)

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, re-committed in respect of the Schedule and in respect of the Amendments to paragraphs (i.) and (ii.) of the proviso to paragraph (*a*) of Clause 3, standing on the Notice Paper in the name of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer as Amendments to be moved on re-committal.

Bill considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. Lloyd-George 1379

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word 'assistance,' to insert the words 'including food or comforts.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir Charles W. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1381
Sir F. Banbury 1381

Amendment agreed to.

July 6.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 14, after the word 'hospital,' to insert the words 'or of the funeral expenses of any such dependent.'"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir F. Banbury 1381
The Attorney-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) 1381

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule.

Mr. Holt (*Northumberland, Hexham*) 1382

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 25, to leave out from the word 'exceed' to the end of the schedule, and to insert—

	s.	d.
"£22 10s. - - - - - - -	5	0
Exceed £22 10s., but do not exceed £25 -	4	6
Exceed £25, but do not exceed £27 10.-	4	0
Exceed £27 10s., but do not exceed £30 -	3	6
Exceed £30, but do not exceed £32 10s. -	3	0
Exceed £32 10s., but do not exceed £35 -	2	6
Exceed £35, but do not exceed £37 10s. -	2	0
Exceed £37 10s. - - - - -	No pension."	

—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to '4s. 0d.,' in line 26, stand part of the schedule."

Mr. Lloyd-George 1383
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1383
Mr. Keir Hardie 1386
Mr. Leif Jones (*Westmoreland, Appleby*) 1387
Mr. Bowles (*Lambeth, Norwood*) 1389
Mr. Simon (*Essex, Walthamstow*) 1390
Mr. Walter Long 1392
Mr. Lloyd George 1393
Mr. J. W. Wilson (*Worcestershire, N.*) 1396
Mr. Chaplin (*Surrey, Wimbledon*)... 1397
Mr. W. R. Rea (*Scarborough*) 1399
Mr. Leverton Harris (*Tower Hamlets, Stepney*) 1400
Mr. Brodie (*Surrey, Reigate*) 1401
Mr. J. M. Robertson (*Northumberland, Tyneside*)... 1402
Mr. Joynson-Hicks (*Manchester, N.W.*) 1403
Mr. Maddison (*Burnley*) 1404
Lord R. Cecil 1405
Mr. Asquith 1406

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 209 ; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 171.)

Question proposed, "That this be the Schedule of the Bill."

Mr. Arthur Henderson (*Durham, Barnard Castle*) 1411

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 210 ; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 172.)

Bill reported, with Amendments ; as amended, to be considered this day (Tuesday), and to be printed. [Bill 295.]

Navigation Works (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged;

Bill withdrawn 1415

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the Clock on Monday evening, Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at eighteen minutes after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 7TH JULY, 1908.

VISCOUNT BOYNE.—Ordered, that the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Monday last, that the right of the Viscount Boyne to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made, and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland 1417

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

NO STANDING ORDERS are applicable to the following Bills:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10): Marriages Provisional Order.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1417

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 1417

Camborne Water Bill.—Reported without Amendment 1417

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 1417

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [H.L.] (**Swansea Orders No. 1 and No. 2**).—Report from the Select Committee. That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the said Orders, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on 24th June last and on the 1st instant respecting the commitment of the Bill to a Select Committee in regard to the said Orders discharged 1417

Garw and Ogmore Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed and returned to the Commons 1418

Swinton and Mexbrough Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons ... 1418

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to 1418

Merthyr Tydvil Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to, with Amendments 1418

Stockport Corporation Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Southwell District Gas Bill; Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill; Seaham Harbour Dock Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1418

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1418

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Colonies: Annual.—No. 563. Gibraltar (Report for 1907) 1418

Trade Reports: Miscellaneous Series.—No. 668. Japan (Report on the Hok Kaido).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1418

Pharmacy (Ireland) Acts, 1875 and 1890.—Order in Council 1418

Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877.—Order in Council ... 1418

Shop Hours Act, 1904 (City of Exeter).—Order made by the Council of the City of Exeter.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1419

Post Office Sites Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow 1419

Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The Lord Steward (Earl Beauchamp) 1419

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}"—(*Lord Beauchamp.*)

The Marquess of Salisbury 1420

On Question, Bill read 2^{a} (according to order) and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

Board of Trade (Provisional Orders) Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Hamilton of Dalzell 1421

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

Lord Ashbourne 1423

On Question, Bill read 2^{a} (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

DISTURBED AREAS IN IRELAND.

Lord Killanin 1424
Lord Denman 1429
Lord Ashbourne 1432
The Earl of Mayo 1435
Lord Killanin 1437
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Crewe) 1438

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 7TH JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Briton Ferry Urban District Council Bill [LORDS].—Read a third time, and passed, with Amendments 1439

Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Thursday 1439

Page

Provisional Order Bills.—Ordered, that so much of Standing Order 73 as provides that notice of the day on which a Bill for confirming any Provisional Order will be examined shall not be given until after the Bill has been printed and circulated, be suspended for the remainder of the session.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) 1439

Bognor Gas Light and Coke Company Bill [LORDS]; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]; Aire and Calder Navigation Bill [Lords]; Stratford-upon Avon, Towcester and Midland Junction, Evesham, Redditch, and Stratford-upon-Avon Junction, and East and West Junction Railways (Amalgamation) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments, Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1439

Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1439

Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill [LORDS]; Northern Assurance Company Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table 1439

Metropolitan District Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1439

Barry Railway Bill.—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1440

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to: Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill, without Amendment; Finchley Urban District Council Bill; Motherwell Burgh Extension, etc., Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to:—North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [Lords].

Amendments to:—Upton Town Hall Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords] 1440

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 302] 1440

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 303] 1440

PETITIONS.

Leaseholds Enfranchisement Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1440

Licensing Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table. 12 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table... 1441

Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill.—Petition against; to lie upon the Table 1441

Poor Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.—2 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 1441

Port of London Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table... ... 1441

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Report, Miscellaneous Series, No. 668; to lie upon the Table 1441

Imperial Revenue (Collection and Expenditure) (Great Britain and Ireland).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 215] 1441

Revenue and Expenditure (England, Scotland, and Ireland).—Return presented, relative thereto; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 216] 1441

Pharmacy Acts (Ireland).—Order in Council; to lie upon the Table ... 1441

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act, 1877.—Order in Council; to lie upon the Table 1442

Colonial Reports (Annual).—Colonial Report No. 563 (Gibraltar, Annual Report for 1907); to lie upon the Table 1442

Board of Education.—Regulations for the Training of Teachers of Domestic Subjects; to lie upon the Table 1442

Roads and Bridges (Scotland).—Return ordered, "showing the rate per pound of assessment levied for Roads and Bridges by County Councils in each county or district of a county in Scotland in each year from 1891–2 to 1907–8, inclusive" 1442

Members of Parliament (Colonial Pensions).—Address for "Return of the number of Members of the present House of Lords and of the present House of Commons who are in receipt of Pensions for service in the Colonies from Colonial funds."—(*Mr. Cooper*) 1442

Intermediate Education (Ireland).—Paper to be printed. [No. 214] ... 1442

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Order made by the Council of the City of Exeter; to lie upon the Table 1442

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Inefficient Crew of Steamer "Stowford" 1442
Construction of a Railway Station at Meenbanid 1444
Date of Indian Budget Debate 1444
Irish Firms and Government Contracts 1444
Tea Imports 1446
Pensions of Naval Officers, Stewards and Cooks 1446
Farmers Co-operative Societies 1446
Towns Adopting the Notification of Births Act 1447
Appointment of Pension Officers 1448
Old-age Pensions and Exemption from Paying Rates 1449
Arrest of Mr. J. Magner at Kildorrery 1449
Distribution of the Gore Booth Estate 1450
Evicted Tenants—Application of Peter Kelly 1450
Forestalling of Irish Fairs 1451

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Page

H.M.S. "Blake"—Labourers on Joiners' Work 1452
Torpedo Boats in the Hamble River 1452
Army Statistics 1454
Volunteer Long Service Medal 1455
The West Riding and the Territorial Army 1456
Army Remounts 1456
Depôt Sergeant-Majors 1457
Indian Postal Rates 1457
Thefts in the Indian Postal Service 1457
Indian Post Office Registration Fee 1458
South African Police 1458
Cairo Drainage Schemes 1459
Egyptian Administrators on Leave 1459
Cairo Newspaper Prosecutions 1459
Persia 1460
Foreign Motor Speed Regulations 1460
Cattle Plague in Egypt 1461
Turkey and Egypt 1461
Closing of Egyptian Drinking Establishments 1462
Egyptian National University 1462
Income Tax Appeals 1462
Tobacco Growing in Ireland 1463
Betting Men and Income-tax 1464
Insurance Agents and Suicide 1465
Public Rights on the Upper Thames 1465
Motor Traffic and Highway Maintenance 1466
Audit of Public Accounts 1467
Motor Traffic in London 1467
Erith Unemployed Grants 1468
Post Office Savings Banks 1469
Half-Timers 1470
Small Holdings and Market Gardeners' Compensation Act 1471
Fruit Trees for Small Holdings 1471
Small Holdings Act 1471
Dividing Societies 1472
Irish Law Court Funds 1472
Irish Congested Districts Board 1474
Canada and Irish Trade 1476
Irish Butter in Scotland 1477
Irish Land Purchase Sinking Fund 1477
Licensing Leases and the Licensing Bill 1478
Autumn Recess 1479

Tobacco Growing in England and Wales 1479

The Wholesale Wine Trade... 1479

Business of the House 1481

SELECTION.

Ordered, That Mr. Munro Ferguson be discharged from the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That Mr. Pirie be added to the Committee.—(*Sir William Brampton Gurdon*) 1481

COMMONS (REGULATION OF TOWYN TREWAN COMMON, ANGLESEY).—Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence relative thereto, brought up, and read.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report, to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [Bill 217] 1481

NEW BILLS.

Local Authorities (Advertising) Bill.—To be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd July, and to be printed. [Bill 304] 1481

Public Health (Sewers and Drains) (No. 2) Bill.—To be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 305] 1481

National Military Training (No. 3) Bill.

Captain Kincaid-Smith (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon) 1481

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, 1907, and to establish National Military Training in the Territorial Force."—(*Captain Kincaid-Smith.*)

Mr. Harold Cox (Preston)... 1484

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 34; Noes, 250. (Division List No. 173.)

Old-Age Pensions Bill.—As amended (in Committee and on re-committal), considered.

New clause—

"The trade or business of pension agent who offers to obtain or to try and obtain pensions for other persons for payment or reward shall be illegal, and such agents shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine of not exceeding £50, or to imprisonment for not exceeding six months.' "—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth) 1489

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 1490
Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.) 1491
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 1492
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 1494
Mr. Ellis Davies (Carnarvonshire, Eifion)... 1495
Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.) 1496
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) 1497

Page
Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) 1498
Mr. G. D. Faber (York) 1499
Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars) 1501
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1502

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 82: Noes, 320. (Division List No. 174.)

Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) 1507
Sir F. Banbury 1510

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out the words 'set forth in Part I. of the schedule to this Act,' and to insert the words 'of 5s. a week.'" (*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'set forth in' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Lloyd-George 1511
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1513

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out the words 'Part I. of.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question, "That the words 'Part I. of' stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Lord R. Cecil 1514

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out the word 'have,' and insert the words 'prove that he has.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'have' stand part of the Bill."

The Attorney-General (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) 1516
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1517
Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) 1519
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 1520
Mr. Barnes... 1521
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1523
Mr. Fell 1525

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. McArthur (Liverpool, Kirkdale) 1526
Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton) 1527

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, at the end, to insert the words, 'provided that in the case of a British sailor residence in the United Kingdom shall be deemed to include service on board a vessel registered in the United Kingdom.'"—(*Mr. McArthur.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir W. Robson 1528
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 1528
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1529
Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) 1530
Mr. H. C. Lea (St. Pancras, E.) 1530
Mr. Bowles... 1530
Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 1531
Mr. A. J. Balfour... 1531

Mr. William Redmond ... 1532
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1532
Mr. Gretton (Rutland) ... 1533
Sir F. Banbury ... 1534
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) ... 1534
Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) ... 1535
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) ... 1536

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 82 ; Noes, 316. (Division List No. 175.)

Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1539

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, at end, to insert the words '(3) The means of the person as calculated under this Act must not exceed £31 10s.'" —(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple).

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, after the word 'until' to insert the words 'the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and ten, unless.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir F. Banbury ... 1540
Mr. Walter Long ... 1541
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1543
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) ... 1545
Lord R. Cecil ... 1546
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1546
Mr. A. J. Balfour ... 1547

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 292 ; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 76.)

Other Amendments made—

"In page 2, line 18, to leave out the word 'such.'"

"In page 2, line 18, to leave out the word 'as,' and insert the words '(other than medical or surgical assistance or relief herein before specifically excepted) which.'"

"In page 2, line 18, after the word 'is,' to insert the words 'expressly declared.'"

"In page 2, line 18, after the word 'not,' to insert the words 'to be.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, at the end, to insert the words 'or a reason for depriving any person of any franchise, right, or privilege.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 1551
Lord R. Cecil ... 1551
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1552

Mr. William Rutherford ... 1552
Viscount Morpeth (Birmingham, S.) ... 1553
Mr. Bowles ... 1553

Amendment agreed to.

Sir F. Banbury ... 1555

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 21, after the second word 'he,' to insert the words 'shall have brought himself into a position to apply for a pension by reason of gambling, drunkenness, idleness, or.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) ... 1556
The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) ... 1558
Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 1558
Mr. Keir Hardie ... 1559
Mr. William Rutherford ... 1559
Mr. Adkins (Lancashire, Middleton) ... 1560
Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) ... 1560
Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.) ... 1561
Mr. James Hope (Sheffield, Central) ... 1561

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Sydney Buxton ... 1562

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 23, after the word 'maintenance,' to insert the words 'or benefit.'"—(*Mr Sydney Buxton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Austen Chamberlain ... 1562
Mr. Sydney Buxton ... 1563
Mr. Keir Hardie ... 1563
Mr. Bowles ... 1563
Lord R. Cecil ... 1563

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Bowles ... 1564
Lord R. Cecil ... 1565

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 2, line 24, at end, to insert the words 'Provided that a woman shall be deemed to have worked for the maintenance of herself and her dependents if she has kept house for others.'"—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Sydney Buxton ... 1565

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord R. Cecil ... 1565
Mr. Barnes ... 1566
Mr. Lloyd-George ... 1567
Lord R. Cecil ... 1567

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 2, line 26, to leave out the words 'up to,' and insert the words 'immediately before,'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'up to' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 1568
Mr. Lloyd-George 1568
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1569
Mr. Keir Hardie 1570
Sir W. Robson 1571

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Bowles... 1572

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 32, to leave out from the word 'Act' to end of page 2, line 36."—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Lloyd-George 1573

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord R. Cecil 1574

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 32, after the word 'him' to insert the words, 'Provided that such property shall not be deemed capable of investment so as to bring in a larger return than at the rate of 2¾ per cent. per annum.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lloyd-George 1574
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1575
Mr. Lloyd-George 1575
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1576
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 1577

And, it being half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 17th June, to put forthwith the Question upon the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

The House divided: —Ayes, 85; Noes, 363. (Division List, No. 177.)

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question upon the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 12, after the word 'after,' to insert the words 'the day on which.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 372; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 178).

Other Amendments made—

"In page 4, line 27, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words '(except in the case of a question which has been originated by the pension officer and on which the Committee have already received his report).'"

"In page 4, line 37, after the first word 'The,' to insert the words 'pension officer, and any person aggrieved, may appeal to the central pension authority against a.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, to leave out from the word 'them' to the word 'referred,' in line 40 and to insert the words 'within the time and in the manner prescribed by regulations under this Act, and any claim or question in respect of which an appeal is so brought shall stand.'" —(*Mr Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, that the Amendment be made."

The House Divided:—Ayes 360; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 179.)

Other Amendments made—

"In page 5, line 28, after the word 'person,' to insert the word 'knowingly.'"

"In page 6, line 30, after the word 'pension,' to insert the words 'and for notice being given by registrars of births and deaths to the pension officers or local pension committees of every death of a person over seventy registered by them, in such manner and subject to such conditions as may be laid down by the regulations.'"

"In the Schedule, page 7, line 22, after the word 'pension,' to insert the words 'per week.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Bill to be read the third time upon Thursday.

Coroners (Ireland) Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; Bill read the third time, and passed 1592

Adjourned at eighteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS, WEDNESDAY, 8TH JULY, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (Money) Bill; South-West Suburban Water Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 25th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^{a}; agreed to; Bills read 2^{a} accordingly 1593

Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^{a}. Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons 1593

Leeds Corporation Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 1593

Doncaster Corporation Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons... 1593

London County Council (Money) Bill.—Committed 1593

South-West Suburban Water Bill.—Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1593

Ards Railways Bill; Holderness Water Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners 1593

Briton Ferry Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1593

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order Bill.—House in Committee (according to order). Bills reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 1593

South-West Suburban Water Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Manchester Corporation Bill and other Bills, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the South-West Suburban Water Bill; read, and agreed to. All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the Petitioners praying to be heard by Counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also Counsel for the Bill 1593

Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Monk Bretton be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Stradbroke; read, and agreed to 1594

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Nos. 4057 and 4058 1594

Board of Education.—Regulations for Training of Teachers for Secondary Schools; Regulations for the Training of Teachers of Domestic Subjects ... 1594

Whisky and other Potable Spirits (Royal Commission).—Interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into and report upon certain matters connected with the manufacture and sale of whisky 1594

Mines and Quarries.—(Explosions at Benwell and Whitehaven Collieries)—Report edited by R. A. S. Redmayne, His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Mines, on the explosions which occurred at the Benwell Colliery and the Whitehaven Colliery; Report by J. B. Atkinson, M.Sc., His Majesty's Inspector of Mines, on the circumstances attending an explosion which occurred at Washington "Glebe" Colliery 1594

Ordnance Survey.—Report of the progress of the Ordnance Survey to the 31st March, 1908, presented and ordered to lie upon the Table 1594

Coroners (Ireland) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 132] 1595

Post Office Sites Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow ... 1595

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to Order.)

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

Lord Atkinson 1595

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'Commissioners' to insert the words 'Provided that the tenant shall sign such consent in the presence of two witnesses present at the same time, who shall attach their names thereto, and when so signed and witnessed shall be filed as a record in the office of the Land Commission, notice of such filing being, in the time and manner prescribed, given to the landlord of the land to which the consent applies, and published in two successive issues of a newspaper circulating in the district in which such land is situate; and provided further that such consent shall not be acted upon if the said landlord, or any other person interested in or having a claim upon the said lands, shall, after having an opportunity of being heard in the time and manner prescribed, satisfy the Judicial Commissioner that the tenant was compelled or induced to give such consent by intimidation or other unlawful means.' "—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

The Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Crewe) 1599
The Earl of Donoughmore 1601
Lord Ashbourne 1603
Lord Clonbrock 1603
The Earl of Mayo 1604
The Earl of Crewe 1605
Lord Atkinson 1605
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1606
Lord Clonbrock 1609
The Earl of Mayo 1609
Lord Atkinson 1609

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

On Question, "That those words be there inserted."

Their Lordships divided:—Contents, 88; Not-Contents, 36.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived; the Report of the Amendments to be received on Tuesday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. [No. 133.]

ECONOMIES IN THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

Lord Lovat 1612
Lord Harris 1617
The Under-Secretary of State for War (Lord Lucas) 1621
Viscount Midleton 1627
Lord Lovat 1628
Lord Harris 1629
Lord Lucas 1629

House adjourned at five minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 8TH JULY, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Ards Railways Bill (changed from "Ards and Bangor Railways Bill").—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

King's Consent signified.—Bill read the third time, and passed ... 1629

Holderness Water Bill.—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

King's Consent signified.—Bill read the third time, and passed ... 1630

Rochester Bridge Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1630

Leith Burgh Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 1630

Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—considered; to be read the third time upon Friday... 1630

Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 1630

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to: Garw and Ogmore Gas Bill; Swinton and Mexborough Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill [Lords] 1630

PETITIONS.

Children Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table 1630

Licensing Bill.—2 Petitions against; to lie upon the Table. Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table. 10 Petitions in favour; to lie upon the Table 1630

Old-Age Pensions Bill.—Petition for alteration; to lie upon the Table ... 1631

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill.—Petition in favour; to lie upon the Table... 1631

RETURNS, REPORTS, &c.

Whisky and other Potable Spirits (Royal Commission).—Interim Report of the Commissioners; to lie upon the Table 1631

Explosions (Benwell and Whitehaven Collieries).—Report, edited by R. A. S. Redmayne, His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Mines, on Explosions; to lie upon the Table 1631

Explosions (Washington "Glebe" Colliery).—Report by J. B. Atkinson, esquire, M.Sc., one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, on the circumstances attending explosion; to lie upon the Table 1631

Board of Education.—Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Secondary Schools; to lie upon the Table 1631

Board of Education.—Scheme for a new Teachers' Registration Council proposed to the Board of Education by the Representatives of certain Educational Associations; to lie upon the Table 1632

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Report of the Progress of the Ordnance Survey to 31st March, 1908; to lie upon the Table 1632

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4057 and 4058; to lie upon the Table 1632

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Inquiries into Charities (County of London).—Further return relative thereto, to be printed. [No. 218] 1632

Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Police Convalescent Home at Brighton 1632
Seating Accommodation in Motor Cabs 1633
Franco-British Exhibition and the Cab Radius 1633
Irish Firms and Post Office Stores Contracts 1633
Isle of Lewis Farms 1634
Reformatory Returns 1637
Arrears of Tenant-Purchasers' Annuities 1637
Disposal of Discarded Service Weapons 1639
Loch Sween Oyster Fisheries 1639
West Loch Tarbert Oyster Fisheries 1639
Aberdour—Buccleuch Fisheries 1640
Exclusive Oyster and Mussel Fishery Rights in Scottish Waters 1640
Scottish Farmers' Co-operative Societies 1641
Result of Part II. of Preliminary Examination for Teachers' Certificates ... 1641
Petitions from Chefs de Famille of Alderney 1642
Transfer of Licence Duties to County Councils 1643
Rights of Kathiawar Chiefs 1644
Small Holding Schemes 1645
Settlement of Purchase Negotiations on the Estate of Mr. D. C. O'Connell ... 1646
Amalgamations of Irish Schools 1647
Bureau of Commerce for Ireland 1647
Political Rights of Irish National School Teachers 1648
Decrease of Consumption in Ireland 1648
Application of James Kenny of Clouncon 1649
Provision of Boots for the Territorial Army 1649

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Helmsdale Harbour, Sutherland 1649
Fife Coastguard Service 1650
Rosyth Harbour Works 1650
H.M.S. "Defence" 1651
Manning of the Navy 1651
Dissensions in the Navy 1652
Welsh and Scottish Cloth 1653
Clothing Contracts for Welsh Regiments 1654
Volunteer Quartermaster-Sergeants 1654
Scottish Tartans 1655
Special Reserve and Jury Service 1655
South African Garrison 1655
Scottish Regiments in India 1655
The D'Angely Case 1656
Woolfardisworthy Postal Arrangements 1657
Aberdeen Postal Arrangements 1657

July 8.] *Page*

French Tariff 1658
Welsh University Grant 1658
American Beef Firms and Income-Tax 1659
Margarine 1659
Balintore Harbour, Ross-shire 1660
Sanitation in the Hebrides 1660
Rate Arrears in Lewis 1660
Congestion in the Island of Lewis 1661
County of Sutherland Education Grant 1662
Highlands Medical Officer of Health 1662
Discussion of Scottish Estimates 1663
Afforestation in Scotland 1664
New Fishery Cruiser 1665
Gooseberry Mildew 1665
Land Purchase Annuities Arrears 1666
Irish Development Grant 1667
Fuel for Irish Schools 1668
Galway Poor Rate Collector 1668
Cattle Driving in Ireland 1669
Crime in Clare 1670
Fermoy Council Meetings 1672
Crime in Leitrim 1673
Crime in Longford 1674
Feenagh Evicted Tenant 1675
Irish Land Stock 1675
Bank of Ireland 1677
Telegraphic Address—" O'Connor, Foynes " 1678
Electoral Reform 1679
The Beef Trust 1680
Ancient Monuments in Wales 1680
Irish Supply 1681
Alleged Foreign Espionage 1681
Army Votes 1681
Appointment of Lords-Lieutenant 1682
Daylight Saving Bill 1682

Irish Universities Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee C.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 219.]

Minutes of the proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 219.]

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Thursday, 16th July, and to be printed. [Bill 306] ... 1683

SUPPLY [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £167,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of Educational Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1909."

Mr. Barnes (*Glasgow, Blackfriars*) 1683

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £166,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Barnes.*)

Mr. Bellairs (*Lynn Regis*) 1694
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) ... 1703
Mr. C. Duncan (*Barrow-in-Furness*) 1712
Mr. Arnold-Forster (*Croydon*) 1716
Mr. Beauchamp (*Suffolk, Lowestoft*) 1723
Sir Ivor Herbert (*Monmouthshire, S.*) 1724
Mr. Croydon Marks (*Cornwall, Launceston*) 1728
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty (*Dr. Macnamara, Camberwell, N.*) 1730
Mr. Arthur Lee (*Hampshire, Fareham*) 1738
Mr. R. Duncan (*Lanarkshire, Govan*) 1739

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 90; Noes, 205. (Division List No. 180.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. £1,334,600, Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances.

Mr. Bramsdon (*Portsmouth*) 1742
Mr. McKenna 1743
Mr. Jenkins (*Chatham*) 1743

Vote agreed to.

3. £868,800, Half-Pay and Retired Pay.

4. £377,400, Civil Pensions and Gratuities.

Resolutions to be reported.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,998, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Fishery Board for Scotland and for Grants in Aid of Piers or Quays."

Sir Arthur Bignold (*Wicks Burghs*) 1744

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,898, be granted for the said service."—(*Sir Arthur Bignold.*)

July 8.]

Page
Mr. Williamson (Elgin and Nairn) 1748
Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs) 1751
Mr. R. L. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire) 1753
Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) 1754
Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs) 1755
Captain Waring (Banffshire) 1756
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 1758
Mr. Sutherland (Elgin Burghs) 1759
Captain Arthur Murray (Kincardineshire) 1765
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1766
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1769
Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.) 1774
Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) 1775
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 1777
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 1778
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1780

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow; Committee also report progress; to sit again To-morrow.

UNEMPLOYED AT GLASGOW.—On the Motion for the Adjournment of the House—

Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars) 1782
Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgetown) 1783
Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College) 1783
Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) 1783
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. J. A. Pease, Essex, Saffron Walden) 1784
Mr. Mitchell-Thompson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 1784

Adjourned at eleven minutes after Eleven o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CXCI.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION)

IN THE

THIRD SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JANUARY IN THE EIGHTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 25th June, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Tyne Improvement.

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Ards and Bangor Railways Bill—(Petition for additional Provision).—Examiner's Certificate of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Wednesday next.

River Wandle Protection Bill [H.L.].—Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

North East London Railway Bill; Bury and District Joint Water Board Bill.—Read 3^a, and passed.

Honourable Artillery Company Bill [H.L.]; Tollemache Estate Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Draycott Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Education Board Provisional Orders Conformation (London) Bill [H.L.]—(No. 1 Order); Post Office Sites Bill [H.L.]; Doncaster Corporation Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]—Report from the Committee of Selection, that the Lord Zouche of Haryngworth and the Lord Wynford be proposed to the House as Members of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of Lord Leigh and Lord Lochee; read, and agreed to.

London and District Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.], London Electric Supply Bill

[H.L.], London (Westminster and Kensington) Electric Supply Companies Bill [H.L.]. — Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over To-morrow.

Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Denman for the Lord Herschell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 111.)

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1.) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2.) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3.) Bill [H.L.], Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. — Read 3ª (according to order); An Amendment made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TREATY SERIES, No. 16. (1908.)

Agreement between the United Kingdom and Spain amending Article 5 of the Agreement of 25th November, 1875, respecting the Postal Service between Gibraltar and Spain; signed at Madrid, 9th April, 1908.

TRADE REPORT ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4013. Japan (Dairen (Dalney)); No. 4015. China (Hankow); No. 4043. United States (Consular District of Philadelphia); No. 4044. Hayti (Republics of Hayti and Santo Domingo); No. 4045. Spain (Consular District of Seville); No. 4046. France (Pondicherry and Karikal); No. 4047. Spain (Canary Islands); No. 4048. Italy (Province of Lecce).

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CIVIL LIST PENSIONS.

List of all pensions granted during the year ended 31st March, 1908, and payable under the provisions of Section 9 (1) of the Civil List Act, 1901.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Order made by the Leyton Urban District Council, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the urban district.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 TO 1902.

Report by the Board of Trade respecting the applications to and proceedings of the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1902, during the past year.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I beg to move the Second Reading of this Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

*THE EARL OF MAYO: There are well-founded rumours, my Lords, that this Bill is to be read a second time. I, therefore, cannot acquiesce in silence in that Reading of this amending Bill, which, I now understand, will be accepted by the House. It is an instance of political vituperation to which we are accustomed in Ireland. We may, however, congratulate ourselves on the fact that the Bill has not been introduced in another place; as a consequence, the landowners and planter tenants with whom it deals will not be subject to the abuse which usually emanates from a certain party in that place who are adepts in that manner of speaking.

In Ireland we know that the Bill is introduced in consequence of a decision of the Court of Appeal with reference to the powers of the Estates Commissioners under the Evicted Tenants Act of 1907. The appellant in the case was Lord Clanricarde, and the Estates Commissioners were the respondents. Three questions were put before the Court, the most important of which was—

> "Are the Estates Commissioners debarred from acquiring the said lands under the provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act on the grounds that the lands are tenanted lands and in 'occupation of a *bona fide* tenant using or cultivating the same as an ordinary farmer in accordance with proper methods of husbandry?'"

The last words are taken from the Act itself. The answer was in the affirmative, and the appellant won his case. Therefore your Lordships will understand that the Bill is aimed at Lord Clanricarde and his planter tenants. I may compare it for a moment to a wasp; it has a sting in it which is meant to stick in its victim. We are told that when a wasp stings it flies away and dies; but this is a more venomous insect, for its sting affects all owners and all planter tenants in Ireland.

As this is an amending Act, I ask your Lordships to consider, for a moment, the Act it amends, and what was said by the noble Earl who leads the House when introducing the Act of last year. The noble Earl then said—

> "This measure, as we fully admit, is only very partially economic and is mainly political."

I think that is perfectly true. Two great questions with regard to Ireland have been decided upon and legislated upon—first, the reinstatement of evicted tenants; and, secondly, the protection of planter tenants. The question of the reinstatement of evicted tenants, I may remind your Lordships, originally arose in definite form in Clause 15 of the Irish Land Conference Report, in which it was stated that—

> "Any project for the solution of the Irish Land question should be accompanied by a settlement of the evicted tenants question upon an equitable basis."

Clauses 2 and 3 of the Act of 1903 deal with these tenants, but the machinery of that Act regarding evicted tenants did not run, in the opinion of the present Government, quickly enough, and the Evicted Tenants Bill of last year was passed.

The debates on the matter are fresh in your Lordships' memory. The noble Earl the Leader of the House, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill of 1907, said—

> "I need not quote any of the statements of Mr. Wyndham to that effect. They have been quoted in this House before—

The noble Earl was refering to the actual merits of the particular evicted tenants. He went on—

> "But your Lordships will remember that he used in this connection the phrase that bygones ought to be bygones, and that it was not wise to stop to inquire from what reason and under what circumstances the evicted tenants had lost their holdings."

The noble Earl disposed of the matter in that graceful manner which one cannot help admiring, though not always agreeing with. The noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition hit the right nail on the head when he said—

> "We are told—I think the noble Earl used the expression—that bygones should be bygones."

Lord Crewe here interrupted the noble Marquess by saying that he had quoted Mr. Wyndham's expression. The noble Marquess continued—

> "I will take it either from the noble Earl or from Mr. Wyndham. It is a good expression. I should like bygones to be bygones, but I want to know a little about some of the bygones with which you are going to deal under this Bill."

I have found a quotation which can be aptly applied to this measure. I give it to the noble Earl in charge of the Bill for what it is worth—

> "As we have a conceit of motion coming, as well as bygones; so have we of time which dependeth thereon."

The Government, I know, are anxious about the Bill, and desire to get it through quickly.

Now, what are the bygones on the Clanricarde estate? I have heard much regarding them, and have at last ascertained some actual facts. This estate was one of the lowest rented properties in Ireland. At the time of the passing of the Land Act of 1881 the rental was £23,350; it is now £19,000—a reduction of only 16 per cent., which covers voluntary reductions as well as Land Court reductions. The average reduction throughout Ireland by the operation of the 1881 Land Act and the fixing of fair rent for second term was nearly 40 per cent. This is taken from statistics published by the Land Commission.

On this estate, rents being low, many tenants declined, and many still decline, to make use of the Land Court. In 1886 the Plan of Campaign was started on this estate. A great number of tenants refused to pay rent, not because they could not, but for other reasons. Two hundred were evicted for non-payment of rent under the Plan of Campaign. But before proceedings were taken, these tenants were offered 20 per cent. abatement on the current year, and anyone who paid one half year's rent was given time. Three hundred tenants on the estate paid on these conditions; sixty-three evicted tenants applied for reinstatement and were accepted, and 140 refused to come in. The owner naturally had to look elsewhere to let these farms and he let them to a number of *bona-fide* agricultural tenants, who are now called planters. A sum of £2,000, at least, was expended by the owner, and the new or planter tenants, it is said, spent at least £2,000 more. These planter tenants for many years carried on their business in a satisfactory manner, and good relations existed between them and the other tenants. So much for the past.

Let us now come to the present. The evicted tenants question was dealt with pretty fully in the Act of last year which is now upon the Statute-book. It became law on 28th August, 1907. The planter tenants on this estate were singled out by agitators and boycotted. The shopkeepers, as is usual in some parts of Ireland, refused to sell them the necessaries of life, and the labourers were circularised not to work for them. Yet we were told that we must pass that Bill in order to heal differences! On 6th October a public meeting was held at Portumna. The chairman was the Rev. Joseph Corcoran, the parish priest, and, to his credit, he deprecated boycotting. But, notwithstanding that, Mr. John Redmond, the leader of the Nationalist Party, spoke these words—

> "I am surprised to hear that any one of them (the planters) would be unwilling to go; and if there is found anyone who is not to go with compensation, that fault will be entirely with the people, and it is absurd to think there can be any peace in the district. I am quite sure the majority of them will agree to go, but whether they agree to go or do not agree, they have to go, and if they do not go it would be absurd for any man to hope that peace could be maintained in that district. If they refuse to go, here, at any rate, the land war will go on, and, indeed, I have no hesitation in saying that, under these circumstances, if there is refusal on their part peace in this district would be a dishonour to Ireland."

That is taken from the report of Mr. Redmond's speech which appeared in the *Freeman's Journal* on 7th October last year.

Naturally, after this, the planter tenants were bullied and put under pressure. They were coerced into giving consent to the Estates Commissioners to quit their holdings; they were strictly boycotted and were also promised by the Estates Commissioners substantial sums to go. Under pressure twenty-one signed consent to go, and this was the real cause of the proceedings in the Irish Courts. On 6th June of this year twenty-one tenants signed saying that they withdrew their consent to go. The paper runs thus—

> "We regret that some of us last year weakly signed papers put hastily before us and under pressure of a threatened impending boycot and with promises of large sums as purchase of our holdings. We declare we withdraw such agreements and refuse to break up our homes."

I have every reason to believe that since then six or more of these twenty-one tenants have withdrawn from the declaration. That is the whole story of the Clanricarde estate. I am not going to make comment upon it whatever. I leave the House to draw its own conclusions. I ask your Lordships whether I was not right when I said that this measure was an instance of political vituperation. If there is anything which shows what political vituperation in Ireland is, it is contained in the speeches of Mr. Redmond. The object of this Bill is to crush Lord Clanricarde and to hit those planter tenants whom Lord Robertson's Amendment last year was designed to protect. They are hit by this Bill through the owner of the property.

I frankly say that I should much like to move the rejection of this Bill; but I know that the two front benches are against me, and before such strength and ability I must bow. But I would submit to your Lordships that, while nominally permissive, this Bill will subject every planter tenant to irresistible pressure to sell his interest; it will result in evicted tenants being restored as purchasers to rented land at prices which would certainly be set up as the standard price which the owner ought to accept from his other tenants. My Lords, I think we have reached the "last phase," or nearly the last phase, of the agrarian agitation and its attendant troubles in Ireland. But when the historian sets down the tale of agrarian agitation and agrarian legislation in that country, when political rancour has been forgotton, has passed away, and is stilled, what must he say of this measure? A landlord, a member of your Lordships' House, sought to protect his planter tenants and his own interests. He appealed to the highest Court in his own country, and that Court granted his appeal. Thirteen days after a Bill was introduced to reverse that decision, and shortly afterwards the House of Lords passed the Second Reading of the Bill.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, as I have on more than one occasion interested myself particularly in the question which we are debating, and as the noble Earl who leads the House referred the other evening very pointedly to some observations that had fallen from me last year, I may, perhaps, be permitted, before the discussion goes further, to offer your Lordships a few observations upon the Government Bill. I should like, in the first place, to make this preliminary remark. Let us remember that we are not to-night discussing the Evicted Tenants Act which was passed last year. That Act is a part of the law of the land. We accepted it with great reluctance. We made no secret of our objection to the principles which it embodied, but we accepted it, to the best of my belief, for one reason, and for one reason only—because His Majesty's Government represented to us very earnestly indeed that, in their view, the measure formed an integral part of a policy of pacification which they desired to bring about in Ireland, and that, if we took upon ourselves to reject that particular item in their programme of pacification, that programme was destined to failure.

It was upon those representations, and upon the strength of those representations only, that this House agreed to pass the Evicted Tenants Bill. But we made one important Amendment in it. We determined that, whatever hardship might arise to the landlords, whatever violation of principle might be involved by the provisions of the measure, we would make, at least, an effort to protect that particular class of tenant whom we have always described as planter tenants, and not all of those tenants, but only such of them as were firmly established in their new holdings, and were treating their land in accordance with the methods of good husbandry.

The only question really before us to-night is, I conceive, this—Did we by the terms of our Amendment go beyond the necessities of the case and beyond the intentions of your Lordships' House? Your Lordships are aware of the interpretation which has been put by the Court of Appeal upon the proviso which we inserted in subsection 3, and, of course, I assume—I think, indeed, it is obvious—that the interpretation of the Court of Appeal is a correct interpretation. We now learn accordingly that the effect of our proviso was not merely to protect the tenant, but to protect the holding from the operation of the compulsory powers which the Act conferred. The result of that is this, that the Act cannot be set in motion against a particular holding unless the consent not only of the tenant but of the landlord also has been obtained. The question I have to ask your Lordships is this—Was that our intention when we adopted Lord Robertson's Amendment last year? The noble and learned Lord will, I daresay, presently tell us what his own view was.

For myself I answer unhesitatingly that it was in my view our purpose not to protect the landlord, but to protect the tenant: and the words which the noble Earl who leads the House quoted the other evening are, I am bound to say, conclusive so far as I am concerned. I endeavoured to show that the number of planters to whom the proviso would apply was a comparatively small number, and I said this—

> "The caretakers, the nondescripts, the birds of passage, will not be protected under the terms of our Amendment. Then there are other of these planter tenants who, no doubt, will be perfectly willing to move elsewhere under the liberal inducements which are to be offered to them. Those men are willing to go and need not be considered."

I could not have expressed my own views in more precise language, and I do not think at the time I was challenged by any of those who were listening to me.

Well, my Lords, are there any reasons why this House should now insist upon a view which, as I conceive, would be entirely different from the view which we entertained last year? I have heard it said that it is a grievous injustice to the landlords of these planter tenants that they should be liable to have a planter tenant removed, and a restored tenant put in his place, and put there under conditions which would render his position infinitely superior to that of the ordinary tenants who are his neighbours. That is perfectly true; but it is a grievance which arises under the Evicted Tenants Act. It is a grievance which arises, for example, in the very much stronger case where the evicted tenant is restored, not on land occupied by another tenant, but where he is replaced upon a farm carved out of the untenanted land in the landlord's own occupation—land which belongs absolutely to the landlord, and in the case of which he holds not only the interest of the landlord but the interest of the tenant also. I say that if we have swallowed such a camel as that I do not see how we can strain at the gnat which is embodied in the Bill on the Table.

Then with regard to the hardship which the Bill might occasion to the tenants. My noble friend who spoke just now with much earnestness upon the subject of the Bill pointed out that many of these tenants, although they might profess readiness to go elsewhere,, would really not be completely free agents in the matter. He pointed out that bribery and intimidation would probably be used without scruple, and that men who were subject to such influences required that additional support which they might expect from the concurrence of the landlord. But, my Lords, although I am quite sure that my noble friend is right when he tells the House that these men will be subjected to great pressure of different kinds, I do not see how this House can take upon itself to go into the motives by which the tenant is inspired when he gives his consent to the process of removal. You may suspect—you may more than suspect—that influences of this kind have been at work; but, after all, if the tenant wants to go, I do not see what you have to gain by trying to force him to stay. I am almost tempted to suggest that a tenant might, in a case of that kind, find a very simple way of defeating the proviso of last year. If pressure had been put upon him successfully and he really wanted to accept the bribe offered to him to go elsewhere, he might cease to cultivate his land in a proper and husbandlike manner, and thereupon at once his holding would cease to come within the scope of the proviso.

The real question is, do the tenants in question, whatever their inner motives may be, want to give up their farms or not? As to that, I am in possession of a piece of evidence which I think it is my duty to lay before the House. I have received within the last few days a letter from the gentleman to whom my noble friend referred—the Rev. Mr. Corcoran, of Portumna, county Galway, from which I should like to read a few words to the House. He begins by saying—

> "I have no motive in the matter but the peace of the district, which is more or less disturbed for the last twenty years owing to the unfortunate evictions on the above estate, but now I hope there are signs of peace and that the Estates Commissioners will be enabled to carry out their arrangements. All the planters are willing to go; in a couple of cases it is only a matter of compensation"—

He means it is only a question of the amount of compensation they will receive—

> "I appeal, then, to your Lordship as a priest and a lover of peace to do all in your power to end this crying grievance by restoring the evicted tenants without any hardship or injustice to landlord, tenant, or planter. The few letters attached show it is only a matter of compensation with the planters. And, as your Lordship knows, the matter would be settled long since if the landlord consented."

He encloses with this letter a memorial addressed to myself, which runs as follows—

> "We, the undersigned new tenants on the Clanricarde Estate, county Galway, do most respectfully ask Lord Lansdowne to use his great influence in passing into law the amending clause to the Evicted Tenants Bill introduced by Lord Crewe into the House of Lords, and thus enable us to carry out our arrangements with the Estates Commissioners, viz., to take reasonable compensation or farms of land elsewhere as good as what we now hold. We wish to add that in making those arrangements we were entirely free."

Here follow sixteen signatures, and the petition concludes with the postcript—

> "The above represent practically all the planter tenants. A few others were to call and sign, but time presses."

The document is dated June 12th, and it is, therefore, I conceive, the most recent document of the series, because I have no doubt my noble friend was right in saying that these unfortunate people have hesitated a good deal, and perhaps have, in some cases, changed their mind more than once. That seems to be really the case for the Government Bill, and it appears to me to be a case which we on this side of the House should not be well advised to withstand.

I will only notice one other argument, and I think it was used also by my noble friend behind me. What he suggested to your Lordships was something of this kind—that there had been a kind of compact over this matter, and that because the Nationalist Party had disregarded the terms of that compact and had not allowed bygones to be bygones, but had threatened and intimidated these particular farmers, we were therefore free to reconsider our position and to deal with it in a spirit different from that in which we might have approached it last year. All that I can say in regard to that is that I should be very sorry if this House were to deal with a proposal of this kind in a spirit of retaliation. If it is true, and I am afraid it is true, that the other side have not fulfilled the undertaking they gave to the public that bygones should be bygones, I trust that, at any rate, the House of Lords will scrupulously fulfil the arrangement to which it was a party last year, and for these reasons I shall give my support to the Second Reading of the Bill.

*LORD CLONBROCK: My Lords, there is no doubt, as the noble Marquess has said, that the Amendment which your Lordships inserted in the Evicted Tenants Bill last year, on the Motion of Lord Robertson, was intended solely for the protection of the planter who was a *bona-fide* farmer, and who wished to remain on the land, and that those who were prepared to accept the inducements offered, and leave, need not be considered, as it might be assumed they were going willingly. Later on in the year it was remarked to me from several quarters that we had omitted to take into consideration the existing state of the country, and that the agitation which was then advancing, owing to the very feeble efforts made by His Majesty's Government to check it, was making such headway that it would be exceedingly doubtful whether anyone giving up his land was doing so of his own free will. Now, in many parts of Ireland, free will has entirely ceased to exist as regards anything connected with land. A man cannot buy or sell, let or hire, according to his own free will; he must follow the dictates of the party of agitation. Therefore it is idle to attach any importance to the stipulation in this Bill with regard to the written consent of the tenant. A written consent is worth absolutely nothing if it is given by a man with a pistol at his head; and this is not a mere figure of speech, it may represent an actual fact. That extreme pressure will be exercised is, I think, clear from the words used by Mr. Redmond at Portumna, when he said that peace in that district would be a dishonour to Ireland. I dislike the Bill, just as I objected strongly to the Act of last year, for I regard it as not only unjust to the landlord, but opposed to all principles of public morality that a man who has joined an illegal and immoral conspiracy, and lost his farm in consequence, should not only be reinstated in it but placed in a more favourable position than he formerly occupied. For the purchase instalment which he will have to pay is less than his former rent. But the principle was accepted last year by your Lordships' House and there is no question, therefore, of opposing the Second Reading. I hope, however, that some Amendment will be introduced in Committee to make sure that the written consent of the tenant is not an idle form.

*LORD ROBERTSON: My Lords, as I took some part in the debate last year, it may be right that I should say a few words. I have examined this Bill in a critical, and, perhaps I may say, a sceptical spirit, and having done so, I am bound to say that I think it is not merely consistent with what was done last year, but it carries out what was done last year. Therefore I add my advice to my noble friends from Ireland, with whose general politics I so thoroughly sympathise, that this Second Reading should be given.

What we contended for last year was individual freedom, not the less because it was the freedom of brave men. Our cause was the liberty of the individual to choose to go or to stay. We desired to protect, and we did protect, those who desired to stay. We are asked to-night merely to give effect to the wish of those who desire to go, and it seems to me that we should be defeating our own principle if, merely from anticipating dangers in the district, we did not assent to what is a manifest and plain proposition of justice. We have been told that consent in this part of the country is not consent. I daresay that, to a certain extent, there is some truth in that. On the other hand, we are asked by the responsible Government to pass a Bill which speaks of the written consent of the person concerned. The alternative suggested is that we should supersede this individual and require the consent of a third party, who was not in our consideration at all during the debates last year. That I decline to do, and I decline to do so although I have my conjecture that there may be abuse of this provision.

But I make this appeal to His Majesty's Government. We are about to pass a Bill which, in its provision with reference to a man's consent in writing, uses the language of civilised legislation; and we have a right to ask that the Government should provide civilised administration. Accordingly, I hope it will be borne in mind, from this moment onwards, that in passing this measure we take the Government as giving us a pledge that, as the Legislature speaks to them in the language of civilised legislation, they will reply in the language of civilised administration. One word more. I suppose it may be assumed that in one way or another many of these planters will go. I hope some of them will stay. But, even supposing many of them do go, I do not think this House has any reason to regret this chapter of legislation. These were brave men who stood to their guns in bad times. We have recognised that stoutness and valour of that kind is a thing to be kept in view by this branch of Legislature, at all events, when we are considering questions of this kind; and I believe that our action to-night, in passing the Second Reading of this Bill, will merely confirm the conviction that the House of Lords may be relied upon to stand by the principle of individual freedom, whether for good or for evil.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, with one observation which fell from the noble Earl who initiated this discussion we shall all be in cordial agreement. I refer to his statement that political vituperation was not altogether unknown in Ireland. We have many of us been the subject of it in our time, and I do not know that we are to any great extent the worse. But when the noble Earl speaks of this Bill as an instance of political vituperation, I must say I never saw a Bill drawn in more calm and peaceable terms; and I think, in fact, that what he meant was something a little different. What he intended to convey, and no doubt it was true, was that this Bill was intended to deal with a particular state of things which has arisen in regard to a particular individual.

I do not propose to follow the noble Earl into the history of the Clanricarde estate. The rent statistics of that estate are not really relevant to this particular purpose, nor is the whole management of that estate. What we really have to consider is how far this Bill carries out the intentions of your Lordships' House as expressed in the Act of last year. The noble Marquess who leads the Opposition and the noble and learned Lord who has just sat down stated, in the fullest and most candid manner, that in their opinion the intention of the Amendment, inserted on the motion of Lord Robertson, with regard to the *bona-fide* tenant is carried out in the Bill which I am asking your Lordships to read a second time. It is, I think, common ground that the intention of that Amendment was to do what we all wish to do—to protect the tenant who, for some purpose of his own, desired to remain, provided that he was a genuine and *bona-fide* farmer; but it was not intended to give the landlord or anybody else a veto upon his departure on terms, supposing he found those terms acceptable.

More than that, it is not only a question of the landlord's consent, but the judgment of the Court of Appeal in Ireland absolutely strikes these holdings out of the purview of the Act altogether; and it appears to me that it would be open to anybody, not merely to the landlord, to object to any *bona fide* farmer coming under this particular clause—a result absolutely foreign to the intention of your Lordships' House. Lord Mayo stated that very strong pressure had been placed upon these planter tenants to go, and he spoke of them as having been boycotted. I do not know what warrant the noble Earl has for that statement. I do not think it is accurate to state that those tenants have appeared in the boycotting returns, but, at any rate, as far as the evicted tenants are concerned, I am given to understand that they have behaved with the utmost patience and in a perfectly law-abiding manner, and have not attempted to interfere with those at present occupying the farms. I think I ought to state in regard to the action of the Government in this matter, that this particular result was to some extent foreseen last year by the Chief Secretary when the matter was being discussed in the House of Commons. He said that he saw great difficulty in accepting the clause as it went down from your Lordships' House very much on the grounds which the Court of Appeal have since taken. He, I think, foresaw, although probably not to the fullest extent, that this very question might be raised, and that it was possible that a Court of law would interpret the terms of the clause in the manner in which it ultimately did.

I have now only to thank your Lordships for the manner in which you have received this Bill. Nothing, if I may venture to say so, could have been more absolutely candid than the speeches which have been made with regard to it, and I quite admit, as the noble Lord who has just sat down observed, that the fact that your Lordships are prepared to pass the Second Reading of this measure will be taken as showing that you are anxious to carry out that peaceful policy in which we consider the Evicted Tenants Act of last year to play a considerable part. The noble and learned Lord said he hoped that we, in our turn, would adopt methods of civilised administration. My Lords, it is the absolute desire of my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary to administer the law fairly. Everybody knows who has had anything to do with Ireland that there are certain forms of illegality there with which it is extremely difficult to deal by law. Everybody who has had to do with the administration of Ireland knows that there are forms of boycotting which, I will not say it is impossible, but on the very verge of impossible, to check by the operations of any Act of Parliament; but I am quite certain that my right hon. friend desires to do everything he can to keep those parts of Ireland—not a very wide area—which are in a disturbed condition, as peaceful as he can by all possible methods, relying, as we have said, as long as he can, and if possible always, on the operations of the ordinary law.

On question, agreed to.

Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

CRIMINAL APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD ALVERSTONE: My Lords, I need not assure the House that I have not the least intention of raising any question with regard to the Act passed last year. It has only been in operation for about two months, and any question of amendment or increased power, or anything of that kind, could only be considered after much longer experience. All I will say with regard to that Act is, and I am sure my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack will agree with me, that His Majesty's Judges are doing their utmost to make it a practical Act, and to work it in a way which will strengthen the criminal law. It is in order that we may get as far as possible perfect equipment for that Act that I have found it necessary to ask your Lordships to allow this Bill to have a Second Reading.

This Bill deals with two practical points only. The Act of last year, for reasons which commended themselves to somebody—I really do not know to whom—did not allow all the Judges of the King's Bench Division to be Judges of the Court of Criminal Appeal. I do not know, and I do not wish to inquire, what the reasons for that restriction were. Since then a Committee has been sitting at the instance of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, and has resulted in the Judges of the King's Bench Division devising a circuit scheme which will enable ten Judges to be continuously in London. The matter is difficult to arrange; but I hope the scheme will work. It will come into operation on 12th October. In consequence, the difficulty of providing for the Court of Criminal Appeal will be accentuated. The new circuit scheme could not be worked if the number of Judges of the Court of Criminal Appeal is limited to eight besides myself. I, therefore, find it absolutely necessary to ask your Lordships to increase the number of Judges of that Court. I see no reason for drawing any distinction in the matter, and, therefore, the first clause in this Bill provides that all the Judges of the King's Bench Division shall be Judges of the Court of Criminal Appeal. Of course, the selection of the Judges who are to sit in the Court of Criminal Appeal must rest with the Lord Chief Justice for the time being. The responsibility is, and must be, his. I think I have given sufficient justification for the first clause in the Bill.

By the second section of the Act of last year the registrar is chosen from one of the Masters of the King's Bench Division. At the present time the work is being admirably done by the Master of the Crown Office, but there is no choice, if it became necessary to appoint a new registrar, outside the ranks of the Masters of the King's Bench Division. I have received a memorial from the Masters as to the impossibility of their doing this additional work. That, however, is not my real reason for dealing with this matter, because, of course, they must do the work if it is put upon them. My real reason is that I think it is most important that the registrar should be a man skilled in criminal law. The Bill therefore proposes, in Clause 2, subsection (1), to give power to appoint, in the case of any future appointment, a barrister versed in the criminal law.

Subsection (2) of Clause 2 involves no principle at all. It is that a deputy registrar should be appointed. At present no deputy registrar is authorised by the Statute. Work arising under the Act will have to be done in the long vacation, and it will be absolutely necessary that there should be someone in the office to discharge the duties of the registrar. The Lord Chancellor has already appointed the staff, and it includes a gentleman who has the qualification of a practising barrister of not less than seven years standing, and who is quite competent to discharge the duties. All I desire under this subsection is to give power for a member of the staff already appointed to be allowed to act as assistant registrar. My only aim and object in bringing the Bill forward is to make the body, both judicial and administrative, that has to deal with this Act as efficient as it can be made.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*Lord Alverstone.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I desire to deal quite shortly with the subject of the Second Reading of this Bill. The House will remember that the Criminal Appeal Act had its origin in this House in the year 1906. The following year it was passed by the House of Commons and became law, the proposals being somewhat varied in the second Bill from what they were in the first. In fact, I do not think the differences of opinion were altogether coterminous with party connections; but there were differences of opinion, and they ultimately resulted in a compromise. I have no wish to offer any objection to the Bill submitted to your Lordships to-day by the Lord Chief Justice, although, of course, when it reaches the House of Commons, it may, if it can be considered, encounter the same various currents of opinion as the Bill of last year and which resulted in the compromise now on the Statute-book.

I would remind the House that the proposal that all the Judges of the King's Bench Division should be Judges of the

Court of Criminal Appeal was contained in my original Bill in 1906, but the House of Commons for reasons which we need not speculate upon, objected to all the Judges being members of this Court. If they change their view, I shall not in the least deprecate the change. With regard to future appointments to the office of registrar, I will only say that there is now a very competent registrar, who, I hope, will perform the work for many years to come. With regard to my noble and learned friend's third proposal, the Act says that the Lord Chancellor and the Treasury may provide such assistance as is required. I have provided all the assistance that has been necessary up to the present, and whatever further is required I am prepared, of course, to provide. I think, however, that it is very likely that the House of Commons will be of opinion that if any fresh appointments are made they ought to be made with the sanction of the Treasury and on the responsibility of a Minister answerable to Parliament.

For my own part I should be most happy to be divested of any patronage attaching to my office. I find it by no means the most agreeable portion of my duties. But experience has shown it to be right that those in whom the appointment resides ought to be persons in a Ministerial position responsible to Parliament. Accordingly I suspect that objections will be raised to my noble and learned friend's proposal. At the same time, I desire to recognise the anxiety of my noble and learned friend to make the Act work well, and I should regard myself as most ungrateful if I endeavoured to put any obstacle in the way of any proposals my noble and learned friend made.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, although there is likely to be no opposition to this Bill I would like to say a few words with regard to the position of the Court of Criminal Appeal. My noble and learned friend the Lord Chief Justice has said that the time has scarcely come for judging of the working of the Act, as only a few months have elapsed since it came into operation. I think, on the other hand, that sufficient time has elapsed to allow of our taking stock of the working of this Act.

When, some forty years ago, I made proposals in the hope of obtaining a Court of Criminal Appeal it was prophesied that it would be impossible to create and maintain such a Court in this country, that there would be a glut of appeals, that many Judges would have to be appointed to administer it, that it would frustrate rather than support the acquittal of innocent people, and that nothing but evil would result. Such prophecies were uttered in both Houses of Parliament; they were even uttered by Judges on the Bench. I now claim, as one who has always had the establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal at heart, that the experience we have had of its working has proved all those prophecies to be unsound. In the first place, the Act was drawn with singular wisdom and moderation in respect of all matters to which it referred.

I think the country is much indebted to my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack for the part he has taken in devising and passing so complete an Act. My noble and learned friend has in this instance given proof of the great advantage in the administration of the law which is being derived from his occupying his present high position, and how important it is to the public that he should continue to occupy that position. I give that praise because I think it is especially due. The Act has, with the able assistance of the Lord Chief Justice, been wisely administered, and the Judges have set themselves anxiously to the work cast upon them. They have discouraged appeals which ought not to have been made; they have shown that an appellant may have something to lose as well as something to gain, and the consequence has been that there has not arisen any approach to a stoppage in the administration of justice in consequence of these appeals. There has been, on the other hand, a certain knowledge conveyed to the public that justice will be truly administered in this country, and that for the future there is no fear of an innocent man receiving punishment.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE FUND.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I rise, in accordance with the notice standing in my name on the Paper, to ask His Majesty's Government for the following information respecting claims upon and payments out of the Irish Land Purchase Fund as at 31st May, 1908: (1) What was the total amount of the applications for advances and other claims upon the fund. (2) How much had been paid out of the Fund: (*a*) Into the bank to await clearing of title, etc.; (*b*) Into the Land Judge's Court; (*c*) To the Congested Districts Board. (3) How much had been allocated and distributed to the parties entitled to receive same. I desire to further ask His Majesty's Government: (4) What was the amount of guaranteed 2¾ per cent. stock issued under the Irish Land Act, 1903, down to 31st May, 1908. (5) What was the amount of the cash obtained for same. (6) What was the amount of such stock and cash respectively allotted to the Land Purchase Aid ("Bonus") Fund. (7) What was the amount standing to credit of the Irish Land Purchase Fund at 31st May, 1908, and available towards meeting outstanding and future applications for advances and other claims upon the fund. (8) Does the figure of £175,450, in paragraph 45 of the Report of the Departmental Committee of the Treasury [Cd. 4005.]. include the estimated cost of administering the Irish "Fair Rent" Acts in 1907–1908; if not, how much should be added to the estimate to include the cost of administering those Acts.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, I can give the noble Earl most, if not all, of the information he desires up to 31st May, 1908. The answers to his Questions are—(1) The amount of applications for advances and the estimated amounts required for the purchase of estates and land were altogether £62,742,660. (2) (*a*) The total amount, in respect of advances made by the Estates Commissioners, paid out of the fund into bank to await distribution by a Judicial Commissioner (clearing of title) was £20,404,257; (*b*) the amount paid under Section 7 of the Act of 1903 into the Land Judge's Court was £972,422; (*c*) for purchases by the Congested Districts Board under Sections 72 and 79, the sum of £1,109,819 was advanced; (2) for estates purchased by the Congested Districts Board from the Land Judge, the sum of £94,489 was advanced. (3) The sum of £19,088,158 has been distributed by a Judicial Commissioner; and, in addition, sums amounting to £2,496,500 have been advanced, some of which is distributable by the Land Judge, some by a Land Commissioner other than the Judicial Commissioner, and some does not require an order for distribution. (4) The amount of guaranteed 2¾ per cent. stock issued to 31st May was £28,201,444. (5) This amount produced in cash £24,862,297. (6) The amount of stock allotted to the Land Purchase Aid Fund was £2,651,440, equivalent to £2,332,760 cash. (7) Since 18th May, the cash required for advances has been supplied by temporary borrowings from the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt from time to time as the money is needed. On 31st May the amount thus borrowed for the Land Purchase Fund amounted to £240,000. (8) The figure £175,450, quoted from Paragraph 45 of the Committee's Report, is the total estimated cost of the Land Commission for the year 1907–1908 (less the charge for bonus and the extra receipts), and therefore includes the estimated cost of administering the Fair Rent Acts. I hope that gives the noble Earl most of the information he requires.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I am very much obliged to the noble Lord, and I wish to thank him and the Irish Office for the trouble they have taken in getting out the figures so expeditiously.

LOCAL TAXATION.

Order of the Day read for resuming the debate on the Motion of the Earl of Onslow for Papers respecting the additional duties imposed by Parliament during recent years upon local authorities, and to the increased burdens thereby thrown upon urban and rural rates and upon the members and officials of county and other councils.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (Viscount WOLVERHAMPTON): My Lords, I think that everyone who has taken any interest in our local taxation must feel indebted to the noble Earl the Lord Chairman for having brought this matter before your Lordship's House and in that way before the public. The present state of the relations between Imperial and local taxation I think may be described as chaotic. From time to time emergencies have arisen in the administration of local affairs, and, no system having been laid down or pursued in regard to local rating, local expenditure methods have grown up which are illogical and extravagant.

Twelve years ago the Government of the day came to the conclusion that the time had arrived for a complete investigation of the whole question of local expenditure and its relation to Imperial contributions to be undertaken by a Royal Commission. That Commission was selected with judgment and wisdom. I do not think it would have been possible for a Commission to have been constituted, at all events in the then condition of public business, more competent to investigate thoroughly the whole question of local taxation and the best method of dealing with it. As your Lordships have been reminded, the Commission was placed under the able and competent chairmanship of my noble friend Lord Balfour of Burleigh; and that Commission, having sat for five years and made an exhaustive survey of the whole field of local administration and taxation, presented in 1901 a Report —in its main points a unanimous Report —distinguished by the fairness and justice with which it dealt with a question full of difficulties and complications.

Now in 1908 the question has been again raised. The noble Viscount opposite, Lord St. Aldwyn, referred to the difficulties which necessarily surrounded the late Government in regard to finance, and said they did not feel justified in dealing with the matter in the interval which ensued between the presentation of the Report and the time when they left office. I cannot pass from that Report without remarking that, in my opinion, the Report of this Commission will remain a permanent evidence of the extraordinary ability of the permanent civil servants of the Crown. The Report prepared by Sir George Murray and Sir Edward Hamilton is one of the most statesmanlike and judicial documents of the kind I have ever read; and no doubt whenever Government comes to deal with the subject they will attach great value to their recommendations as well as to those of other Members of that Commission. The Report of the Commission, I am sorry to say, has almost passed away from public attention. As is the case with too many Royal Commissions, the hard work of these gentlemen is interred in a huge volume of evidence of which the value is soon forgotten.

The Lord Chairman did good service by calling attention to the subject once more. Local rates have increased, and are increasing. It is impossible for anyone to say that there is any sign of reduction in local expenditure. Viscount St. Aldwyn has suggested that the system of old-age pensions which His Majesty's Government propose to establish will tend to relieve the poor rate. I wish I could express my concurrence in that view. No doubt some alleviation will result, but it is doubtful whether that will not be counterbalanced by the additional expenditure which I see no chance of preventing. There are certain phrases at the present time about social reform, but it is inevitable that the expenditure to be met of a local character must increase with the growth of the nation; and the point to which your Lordships' attention has been called is whether the means of raising the funds which are necessary to meet that expenditure are proper and fair to all parties—whether the proper proportion is preserved between national and local services, and whether it is just that the burden of many services which are purely national should fall to the extent that it does upon the local authority. And it must be borne in mind that many of these burdens are not the result of any action on the part of the local authority, but are the outcome of the enactments of Parliament.

There is another question, to which I attach even greater importance—the serious addition made in the local debt, the total of which at the present time is, in round figures, £470,000,000. It is not very much behind the National Debt. It must not be forgotten that a large proportion of that debt is what the late Lord Goschen called a remunerative investment; and, although all councils have made mistakes—I believe that all Parliaments have made mistakes from time to time—on the whole the expenditure, vast as it has been, is to a considerable extent remunerative. My noble friend Lord Onslow seemed to think that the Local Government Board did not defend the interests of the ratepayers. I most respectfully differ from him in that opinion. The late Mr. Gladstone laid it down again and again that one of the main duties of that Department was to protect the ratepayers of the future. Parliament is too ready to authorise and facilitate future expenditure for which it has not got to find the necessary money. I suggest that Parliament should discourage as far as possible the practice which local authorities are inclined to adopt of asking for legislation when they ought to obtain the powers which they desire by provisional orders. By the latter method great expense would be saved, and the necessary control by the Local Government Board would be secured.

I do not propose to submit any suggestion as to the mode in which this question should be dealt with now. I quite agree with the noble Earl the Lord Chairman as to the desirability of the Report which Lord Goschen made in 1871, and which I took up and carried on in 1893, being brought more up-to-date. There has been a great change in local administration, there has been a fuller development of local government, and there has been a more complete testing of the working of the late Lord Ritchie's great Act of 1888; and I think we could now have the facts set out in a more condensed and readable form than was the case in the Reports prepared by Lord Goschen and myself.

I desire to make one remark with reference to the injustice of the present system of local taxation. In your Lordships' House, and by a large section of the other House, the question is often looked at too exclusively perhaps from the agricultural point of view. I quite admit that there is a strong case in regard to the taxation of land, at all events in the case of the farmer, who often has to pay heavy rates on the rent, which is really part of the capital with which he carries on his business. But the same grievance exists in urban taxation. The shopkeeper, the man who is engaged in any large mercantile or manufacturing pursuit, is obliged to pay a large rent in order to carry on his business, and he is rated on that. But the merchant, who is perhaps making much greater profits than either the farmer or the tradesman, is exempt from local taxation altogether, except, perhaps, in respect of the bare rent of the office or warehouse in which he carries on his business. The grievance, which is confined to no one class, but extends through the whole of our local taxation system, is that the producer, the manufacturer, is really taxed on a large portion of his capital as if that capital were all income.

There is a very strong case, too, of extravagance on the part of local authorities where they do not find the money themselves. I am satisfied that there is a danger, if any change is made in the direction of granting more public money to local authorities, of extravagance, though that might possibly be guarded against by the strict supervision of the central authority. It is impossible to make any reform in local taxation unless we have a new and uniform system of valuation. The difference between what is called the gross rental and the assessable value as it stands at present is very considerable. I think the gross rental is about 250 millions, while the assessable is about 46 millions less. The system is indefensible because we have no system at all. I hold that there should be but one assessable value for all taxation—that the valuation for the income-tax and every other tax which is based on property should be uniform, and as near as possible to the actual figures of the case. The Government have declared their intention of dealing with the question next year, and it is time that a Government did deal with what has been a pressing demand for many years.

The keystone of the whole position is a reform of the Poor Law. The present Poor Law system is utterly out of date, and until it has been dealt with and placed upon proper and wise principles we cannot rely upon any satisfactory dealing with the question of local administration and local taxation. The Prime Minister has pledged himself to that, and he has promised that one of the first questions that will be taken in hand will be the relations between local and Imperial taxation. I recognise that it is the duty of Parliament, so far as local taxation is concerned, to remove the present crying grievance, of which all parties and all classes justly complain.

LORD BELPER: My Lords, I do not think it is desirable that this debate should close without some expression of opinion on behalf of the county councils, who are deeply interested in the question of the great increase that has been placed upon the rates by the large number of measures which have been entrusted to them to administer. Let me say at once that I lay much greater stress on what I may call the second part of Lord Onslow's resolution. I am not sure that the view which has been expressed by some speakers that county councils are so much overworked that they cannot properly undertake the duties, and will be likely to leave it to officials, is quite borne out by what I believe to be the facts; but I look with some alarm on any Act which suggests that county councils should administer duties which are outside the scope of their present work. I think the Act now before Parliament which suggests that it is the duty of county councils to collect a part of the taxes, even if that money should go to the county councils themselves, will be looked upon with very great dislike by the county councils. They have no officers to do the work, they are in no way conversant with it, and from what I am led to suppose is likely to be the sum set aside for the purpose of collecting these taxes, it seems to me wholly inadequate to recompense a body like the county council for the work they will have to do.

As to the large increase in the rates, let me say that there is no body of men more aware of the present state of the case than the county councils themselves. I have the honour of presiding over the executive council of the County Councils Association, and there is not a meeting when resolutions are not received from county councils dealing with the financial aspect of these new measures, and asking us to put before the Government the fact that the burdens are becoming excessive and that the ratepayers are very insistent in their demand for relief. We ourselves passed a resolution as recently as last month on the lines of the settlement suggested by the Local Taxation Commission—that national services should be paid for mainly out of national funds. That, I think, well expresses what the feeling of county councils is, with regard to the numerous matters which they have at present to administer. We have already had three deputations to Ministers on this very point during the past two or three months, and though much sympathy has been expressed at the position of the county councils, no relief has, at present, been offered.

Although most of the speakers have referred to the increase in the rates during the last seven or eight years, the chief grievance we feel is at the large increase which was necessitated last year, and which is likely to again be rendered necessary this year, in consequence of fresh legislation. However interesting an historical account of what has taken place during the last few years may be, in a matter that touches the pocket of the ratepayers the history of to-day is very much more important; and although we have had no relief in the past, the ratepayers at all events hope that there may be some little relief in store for them at the present. Lord Fitzmaurice, who spoke with a great knowledge of local government, put his finger at once on the two main causes of complaint which the county councils have to bring before the Government —namely, the increased cost of the main roads, and of the administration of education. But here, again, no remedy was suggested by the noble Lord, except that those who complained should wait for another couple of years. But at least seven years ago it was reported by the Royal Commission on Local Taxation that the question was in an acute stage. They stated that, owing to the large increase of traffic on the roads and their cost, the main roads should be paid for out of national funds. That was in 1901. Surely to-day the case is overwhelming in favour of additional aid being given to the county councils for the upkeep of the roads.

The same view holds good of the increased cost of education. The rate that has to be raised for education constitutes a very heavy charge on the ratepayers. It is considerably more than double the whole of the county rate for other purposes; and it falls with excessive hardship through the fact that many of those who now have to pay the heavy education rate had their schools kept up without the payment of any rate on their part. I should like to bring the history of this question a little more up to date, and to refer particularly to the expensive administration of medical inspection. The House will remember that when that Bill was passed last year I made as strong a protest as I could, on behalf of county councils, against this charge being placed on the county authorities. We felt that it was not only likely to be a serious charge, but a charge which would be much larger in counties than in boroughs owing to the fact that the schools are more scattered. I regret to have to remember that I received very little support from either side of the House, except from among some of my noble friends who sit near me.

But I did receive support which I thought at the time was especially valuable. Lord Goschen, in one of the last speeches which he made in your Lordships' House, said that, averse as he was to the suggestion that any further subvention—of which he did not approve in principle—should be given to local authorities, yet he thought this was a case where a subvention ought to be given to county councils, medical inspection being really a national charge which ought to be met to a considerable extent out of national funds. What is the result? We find now, after the regulations have been issued by the Local Government Board, that medical inspection is likely to be much more expensive than we thought at the time. We had a very important deputation to Mr. McKenna, who was then President of the Board of Education, upon this matter early in the present session, and Mr. McKenna on that occasion entirely sympathised with the view put before him by the County Councils Association—that education was becoming unpopular because of the large amount that had to be raised for it on the rates. He agreed that that was a great misfortune. He went on to say that, although he could not set aside any sum this year for medical inspection, he intended making an alteration in the mode of paying the grants for education, and that would be a great benefit to the ratepayers as it would not only cover the provisions of the Education Act, but also give a substantial sum for the purpose of meeting medical inspection. I ventured to suggest that we should much prefer it if he could deal with the question at once, rather than leave it to the chance of what would be left over under the proposed Bill. His answer was that he regretted he could not there and then promise a grant to cover the immediate cost of medical inspection, but he assured the deputation that the proposals in the Bill would do far more than meet the cost of the additional requirements, and that it would be possible for them to meet their ratepayers with a substantial reduction in the rates. That was practically the only grain of comfort given us by the Government. I think Mr. Buxton said the same thing, that if this House passed the Education Bill the ratepayers would be very substantially benefited.

What is the actual case? While largely increased grants are being given, there is a provision attached to the Education Bill—the same provision which, I think, was excised from the Bill of two years ago—which proposes to do away with the three-fourths now paid by the minor authority in the case where a school has been built either by the school board or since, and to put the whole of that on to the general rate. As your Lordships know, in a great part of the counties the schools have been wholly built by the people in the parishes themselves. Those schools have been paid for, and the obligations in respect of them concluded.

The proposal now is that where the school board has had to raise a loan and has not been able to meet its obligations the locality shall be relieved of three-fourths of the rate and this shall be put as a burden on the rest of the county.

What is the effect of that proposal? I have the figures for thirty-seven counties, and I find, calculating the expense of the provisions of the Bill if it passes in the form in which it has been brought in and also of this transference, that the effect would be that in every one of those counties except three the rates would be very largely increased. So far from its beng a benefit to the counties and therefore an inducement to us to pass the Bill, as the matter stands it is exactly the reverse. I quite admit that the particular parishes which have these large rates will be considerably relieved, but the fact is that the general rate of the county comprising the larger area will be largely increased by the effect of these proposals. In my own county the rates will be raised more than 2½d. in the £, and that will be the effect, as far as we can see, of provisions which we are told will be of real benefit to the ratepayers.

It has been said by Lord Fitzmaurice that if there was any feeling on the part of the county councils it was rather a feeling against centralisation. He went on to say that he was fully agreed, as we all are, that local authorities should be subject to the general direction of the central authority; and he added that the check could not be too severe, and that in this way the authorities were prevented from scattering their money lavishly about. I hope that my noble friend, with his large knowledge of county council work, did not include county councils among those bodies who scatter their money lavishly. I can only say from my own experience that I cannot recall a single instance where the Local Government Board has done anything to prevent expenditure on the part of county councils; but, on the other hand, there are cases where this centralising influence has had the effect of increasing very largely the expense of county councils.

Let me cite two examples. It has been the custom in Acts of late years, partly for the purpose of passing them more easily through Parliament, and partly, I think, because it is absolutely necessary in some cases, to give power to the Government Department concerned to draw up regulations under which the Act is to be administered. This is no doubt very useful, and as long as the funds are to be raised out of the Exchequer there is complete check, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer will not find the money unless he is satisfied that the regulations are of a proper character and do not involve unnecessary expense. But where the funds are provided by the county this is not so. Take the case of weights and measures. Only a year ago there was a new issue of regulations by the Local Government Board, made, I admit, in the interests of efficiency, but putting an unreasonable burden on the counties. We have no voice in the matter, and the regulations are imposed without county councils having any power of making representations. In my own county an expenditure of £250 was caused by these regulations, and I am told that the expense will be much larger next year. I am certain that if these regulations had been drawn up by someone on the spot who knew the circumstances of the county, an unnecessary charge could have been saved without interfering with efficiency. Then there is the case of the new regulations issued by the Board of Agriculture in regard to swine fever. They were so large that the clerk to the county council assured me that in order to get them posted in the way suggested he had to pay a bill of nearly £50. I am told that they will cost a small county from £150 to £200 this year, and the probability is that before many of them are read they will be again altered by the Board of Agriculture. It is not as if the central authority were going to pay the bill themselves. In these matters the bill has to be paid by the county council, and if their discretion is taken away and measures are imposed upon them which make a considerable charge upon the funds of the county, you cannot be surprised if the county councils smart under a feeling of injustice. They feel very strongly that in cases of this sort some relief should be given to them. I can assure the House that the county councils are ready to discharge all their duties and to do their work as efficiently as they can, but they feel that there should be some hope that they will not have further burdens imposed upon them.

*LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, I shall not trouble your Lordships either as to present administration or as to Bills that may hereafter come before us, but I wish to say a word or two on the general question of the rates and their burden and the way in which the matter has been treated. First of all, let me say that I think people use too often the phrase that matters of a national character should be paid by the nation and local charges should be borne by the locality. There is hardly a charge which is defrayed locally which cannot, from a certain aspect, be considered of a national character. If we are to have any formula on the question of national and local charges, it should be that the burden should follow the administration. I think we all feel that subsidies are very dangerous, and that those who have the determination of the expenditure should bear the main burden of raising it.

Much of this debate has been of a very interesting and instructive character. I should like to associate myself with one or two points made on the other side as to remedies that may be introduced. I entirely agree with the noble Viscount Lord St. Aldwyn, on the importance of making those who have the power of administering these charges conscious of their responsibility and of their burden. Considerable evil has arisen out of the wholesale compounding for rates, which does tend to conceal from persons what they are actually paying. If the ordinary working man in London who occupies a couple of rooms at 6s. or 7s. a week realised that he was paying £6 or £7 a year towards the local government of London, he would probably take greater interest in his local government. I associate myself entirely with the speech of the noble Lord the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and I wish to emphasise his statement that a proper valuation is one of the measures which lie at the root of reform in local administration. However much the area may be extended there will still be danger of abuse and unfair valuation in localities. It is a ridiculous thing that you should have boards of guardians and various rural authorities making assessments. Even so large an area as a county borough may have an unfair assessment, and an unfair assessment is always a deliberate under-assessment. The noble Lord opposite, Lord Balfour, quoted yesterday, as a sharp contrast, Oldham and Bournemouth. It is not the business of any legislation to try to remedy inequalities of fortune between persons and localities. A rich place like Bournemouth must have larger means, and, therefore, can indulge in larger local expenditure than a poor industrial town. Oldham, I happen to know, is a town which deliberately has an excessive under-valuation of its property. Unless you apply the income-tax assessment and take a reasonable percentage off that, you have a temptation in many places to falsify the valuation. Under the Education Act a district becomes a poor district and obtains a subvention from the State if it shows a valuation below a certain figure *per capita*. It is, therefore, in the interest of the taxpayer who gives subventions, as well as, in a large area like a county, in the interest of the county as against the various districts, to have an honest and fair assessment.

But I do not think the question of assessment is the only one which lies at the root of reform in this matter. I do not think you can dissociate the question of local taxation from that of local self-government, and the question of local self-government is very largely a question of suitable areas. While I agree that in legislation the two things may be taken separately, I do not think we can afford to neglect the recollection that both are important. I wish to associate myself with what Lord Balfour said as to the great importance of a good Valuation Bill, which, anyhow, must be a complicated and difficult thing. It would tread upon a good many people's toes and offend a good many interests, and it would be well if we could dissociate that piece of practical legislation from more controversial questions such as separating capital from annual value. A good Valuation Bill would require ample time for debate, and there is quite enough in a Valuation Bill without complicating it by the introduction of other matters.

I wish, in passing, to touch upon the suggestion made by Lord Onslow, which has not been noticed by any speaker since, that the only remedy for the evils of local taxation was to fall back on tariff reform. If we were to adopt taxation upon agricultural products on the lines suggested by Mr. Chamberlain we should raise something like £11,000,000 a year in taxation upon those articles consumed by the people, and in addition, by raising prices, we should endow the agricultural interest with about £10,000,000 more. That is to say, we should put a burden on consumers of about £21,000,000 a year. The debate has turned largely on the grievances of the rural rather than of the urban ratepayer. The noble Earl the Lord Chairman used the word "we"—not as meaning your Lordships' House as a legislative assembly, but landowners and persons interested in agricultural land. The question of rating is a far wider one than that of the agricultural community. The burden of rates levied upon the occupiers of agricultural land of the United Kingdom is not more than £4,000,000 a year. The relation that bears to the cost of production of the food and other crops of the country put upon the market is about 2 per cent. People talk as if the burden of the rates was one of the most tremendous burdens on agriculture. It really is one of the least.

In talking of the burden of rates one of the great questions is on whom the incidence falls. Apart from temporary fluctuations, the permanent rate is just as much, in agricultural communities, a landlord's charge as is the tithe. The first charges on the land are the tithe, the rates, and the landlord's rent; and any increase either of the tithe or the rates must come out of the rent. You cannot get more than an aggregate of those three together, and the question of agricultural rates is more a landlord's question than a tenant's question. Every noble Lord knows that if he has a farm which is tithe free he lets it for a higher rent than a farm which has to pay tithe. It is the same with the rates. We shall never discuss this question properly by mixing the rates up and talking generally about the rate as a whole. They are as different in their economic operation as it is possible for them to be.

The noble Viscount on the front bench spoke of the rates on manufacturers and shopkeepers as being a great burden. I contend that the rate on any place used for business is part of the cost of production, and must fall on the purchaser. A shopkeeper taking a shop in Bond Street pays an enormously enhanced rent, and consequently much higher rates, because he finds that from his position he can do more trade, and purchasers pay longer prices than they would do elsewhere. As I say, we cannot discuss this question properly by talking generally about the rates as a whole. We must bear in mind what the particular rate is, what its incidence is, whether it hampers industry, and whether it presses on the life of the people. If I were asked to say what rate in my opinion was the most oppressive as keeping down the standard of civilisation and health among the poople, I should say it was the urban rate upon the inhabited houses of the poor.

One word more. Lord Balfour drew a contrast between urban rates and rural rates on the ground that urban rates were expended beneficially for some direct profit to the ratepayers, but that rural rates were not. I think nearly all rates are expended for the benefit of those who pay them. The noble Lord spoke as if the agricultural ratepayer got no benefit from the main roads. Everyone derives benefit from good roads. Do you suppose that people would get their commodities brought to them so cheaply if the country grocer and tradesmen had not good roads? It is absurd to imagine that you do not derive benefit unless you personally use the roads. I feel that this question is one which deserves fuller discussion than it has had, but I wish to press that it is no use merely to grumble of the incidence on a particular class of property, for a large part of the rates we pay are passed on to quite different people; and, so far as rates are not a charge on property, to a very large extent, except so far as they fall on inhabited houses, they are a charge which every producer and manufacturer passes on to the general consumer. But that is, of course, no reason why the general system should not be revised.

*LORD ZOUCHE OF HARYNGWORTH: My Lords, I shall not detain the House for more than a few minutes, and I should like to confine my remarks to discussing any possible remedies that may be thought of for putting an end to this very serious state of affairs. It seems to me that one of the principal reasons why financial burdens are so often shifted from national to local shoulders, so to speak, is that the local authorities present the line of least resistance, and this line of least resistance is produced by the system of compounding.

I should like to associate myself with every word which fell from the noble Lord who has just sat down, on the subject of compounding and the evils which it brings about. Under that system the increasing burdens put on the ratepayers do not come home to the majority of the electors. It is futile to argue that they pay them indirectly. It is quite a different thing from a system whereby the rates are demanded from each person as a separate payment. The system of compounding for rates was started originally for two main purposes. I am afraid that one was possibly for party reasons at the moment. It was also started as a convenience to avoid loss in collection, but in many cases there is absolutely no direct economy in that system.

I will take, for instance, a few figures concerning the borough of Poplar. In 1906–7 the allowance in Poplar to owners of property in respect of their collection of rates, because part of the compounding system is to make large abatements to owners for the burden they take upon themselves of collecting rates from small people, amounted to £37,000, which I am informed represents a rate of something like 1s. in the £. Take, on the other hand, an instance to the contrary, because it is not every authority which has adopted the compounding system. In the borough of Lewisham, which does not compound for its rates, there was a loss in the collection of rates directly amounting to £6,000 in the year 1905; but that compares with £14,400 which would have had to have been allowed to owners if the compounding system had been in force, so that you have a gain of over £8,000 to the borough, equal to a 2d. rate. Therefore in my view the compounding of rates is the *fons et origo mali* to a large extent, and a great deal of the present evil would naturally right itself if it were done away with, because it would be to the interest of thousands of people not now directly interested to put an end to municipal extravagance.

There is another remedy—that of fixing a lower limit of rateable properties to come under the compounding system. There is an idea that if the limit were reduced to £12 it would go far to diminish the evil. A third remedy is the sending round to people when they pay their rent a card showing how much is rent and how much is due to rates; but I am afraid that not one man in a hundred would take the trouble to read it or to dissociate one thing from another. I feel that, if things go on as at present, we shall soon approach a system under which our taxation will gradually fall practically into the hands of designing persons, who will use their opportunities for plundering the people for their own benefit. That has ruined many other countries and, if things remain unchecked, may lead to the ruin of this country.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, although the noble Lord opposite complained a few moments ago of the somewhat confined nature of this debate, I am sure that on a subject which is not usually considered exciting your Lordships will feel that we owe to the noble Earl a most interesting discussion. I would not have ventured to intrude at all but that nobody who has hitherto spoken has taken the point which I myself feel, that the London County Council is perhaps the most important of all the instances of difficulty which have arisen in the discussion so far as it has proceeded.

The London County Council is the worst instance of over-work of any local body in this Kingdom. It has also been the heaviest loser by the insufficiency of the assigned revenues. Again, it is also the greatest sufferer from the innumerable Acts affecting it passed since 1888. I do not for a moment suggest that one party or the other in the State is to blame in this matter, but I think the general spirit of our legislation has been faulty in the extreme in the want of check on the continual imposition of fresh duties on local authorities which they can hardly perform. In old days it was held to be the duty of the State to interfere as little as possible in the private life of the people. Now, certainly in London every child is pursued by the attentions of the London County Council from the cradle to the grave. The County Council comes upon the scene the moment the midwife is called in, in the notification of the birth. As soon as infant life begins the London County Council is responsible for seeing, if the child is not well looked after by its parents, that it is removed from their care. Prevention of cruelty involves all sorts of inspectors. Then there is everything connected with education, including meals, special schools for the deaf and dumb, and for the physically deformed, quite apart from technical education, which is making rapid headway. The London County Council has the supervision of the milk, the water, and the food supply generally, and when the child is growing up baths and washhouses are provided for the cleanliness of the person; if verminous, there is a special treatment, and if an inebriate a special infirmary. When in search of labour there are labour bureaux; if serving in a shop, shop hours and shop seats; if serving in a factory, special and new provisions. For amusements, there are the parks, and even the provision of boats and gymnasia. Then there are tramways and other means of locomotion, and, in case æsthetic feeling may be hurt by sky-signs, they have all been placed under special inspectors of the County Council.

Year by year additions are made to the already inordinate mass of these duties, and if I call attention to them it is only because I feel that an effort should be made by both parties in the State to put a check on the tendency to slip powers through Parliament which, without making any charge on the Imperial Exchequer, do so often throw heavy charges on the local rates. The noble Earl, Lord Onslow, never said a truer thing than when he stated that the ratepayer has no friends. Even a charge of a ten pound note on the Treasury is carefully scrutinised, but matters which are going to cost local authorities thousands and hundreds of thousands of pounds are passed through Parliament with the merest modicum of consideration. Great stress has been laid on the benefit of valuation, and if a Valuation Bill could be removed from the more controversial subject, much good might be done.

Then the noble Viscount opposite laid great stress on the Report of the Poor Law Commission. He spoke of it as almost recasting local government. But I would ask, if that is the view of His Majesty's Government, why have they been so previous in going into the matter of old-age pensions without waiting for the Report of the Poor Law Commission? If local government hangs so largely on that Report, why, in a most essential particular, have the decisions of that Commission been reviewed beforehand by the Government? I ask for some assurance from the Government of a more complete character. The noble Viscount who served at the Local Government Board told the House that while he was there he used his utmost endeavours to keep a hold on the local authorities. Lord St. Aldwyn told us yesterday how very dangerous is the position the present President of the Local Government Board has taken up. I cannot imagine anything more unconstitutional in regard to expenditure than the attempt which has been made in Government Bills of the last two years to place on local authorities great charges, in the decision of which they are to have no voice. To order a local authority, as may be done under the Town Planning Bill, to put up, at their own expense, a large number of buildings which they do not consider necessary seems to me a great innovation and one of a most dangerous and retrograde character.

I am sorry to say it in this House, but I think we in the London County Council have a very grave complaint to make against the President of the Local Government Board. Before this Bill was introduced we addressed a formal request to him urging him to receive a deputation concerning the contemplated proposals, and after having waited more than two months for an answer, received a curt negative. Considering that many millions have been spent under existing Acts by the London County Council, that was, at all events, a scarcely courteous way for a Minister at the head of a great Department to treat representatives of that Council. I cannot help feeling that nothing can be done towards re-casting local expenditure unless the Local Government Board will act much more efficiently as a watchdog and a check upon local bodies. You have the Treasury in the case of the taxpayer, but in the case of the ratepayer the Local Government Board appear for the moment to have gone over to the enemy. They are not merely not acting as a check, but are acting as an incentive to local expenditure.

As far as our experience in London goes, I know of nothing which tends less to good administration than the doles given by the Exchequer to meet part of the cost of certain services; and I cannot help feeling that any recasting of local government must go upon the lines of the Exchequer taking back certain services, as was suggested by Lord St. Aldwyn last night, and being wholly responsible for them. At present the London County Council is responsible for the disbursement of an enormous sum upon national services, and this addition to their work, carried on by nearly thirty committees, makes the amount of labour such as to give rise to serious apprehension that men will not be found willing to give up four or five afternoons each week to discharge the duties.

I think this discussion has brought out very clearly some points of difference, but it has elicited many points of agreement also. I hope that we shall hear from the noble Earl the Leader of the House something more than allusions to methods of valuation and advice to wait for the Report of the Poor Law Commission. It is the duty of the Local Government Board to act as a check upon the many rash and sometimes faddy proposals which are so quickly passed through Parliament and have added enormously to local burdens, and which, if they are unfortunately indefinitely continued, must lead to a recodification of the law of local government, and, I hope, the striking out of a very considerable number of services which never ought to have been instituted and which are at present a serious embarrassment to the efficiency of local government.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I think by common agreement this has been a very interesting debate, and, if it is inconclusive, it only shares that quality with some of the most valuable and important discussions that have taken place from time to time in your Lordships' House. These debates which rove over a considerable area, are very often, I think, among the most genuinely fruitful that take place in the House of Lords.

The noble Viscount who has just sat down spoke of the extra duties and burdens placed upon local authorities. This was also, to a great extent, the text of the very interesting speech which we had from Lord St. Aldwyn, in which he made certain definite proposals in the direction of centralisation. He proposed that the State should take over the lunatic asylums as it had taken over the prisons, and proceed, perhaps, later on, to take over the care of idiots and feeble-minded people, infirmaries, and Poor Law schools. Those are suggestions into the details of which I do not propose to enter this evening; but I think the House must recognise that this question of centralisation, attractive as it may sound, has two sides to it. There is a curious, and, as I think, very often an unreasoning dread on the part of the people of this country, of Government Departments. They will accept from a county council, whose opinions they believe they can sway, that which they would not take from a Government Department; and this peculiarity of the English people, which makes government in some respects in this country infinitely more difficult than it is in some countries on the Continent, has to be borne in mind.

Moreover, we do not always find agreement as to what it is desirable local authorities should do. We brought in a Scottish Land Bill which proposed to relieve county councils of both the management and the cost of small holdings, and noble Lords from Scotland and elsewhere called heaven and earth to witness that we were insulting the county councils by not allowing them to take over this entirely new duty. On the other hand, when we instituted an English Land Bill, in which great powers were given to commissioners and the central body, we were told that we were insulting English county councils by not putting proper confidence in them, and were forcing action upon them through a hard and callous bureaucracy. Therefore we see how exceedingly difficult it is to please everybody in this matter.

The noble Viscount who has just sat down dealt particularly with the London County Council. He gave a most interesting and epigrammatic list of the vast number of duties which are now thrown upon that authority. He instanced all the duties connected with the care of children from the time of their first appearance in the world. As the noble Viscount went through the list, I could not help thinking what an enormous benefit it is that there should be this network of machinery for the advantage of the children; and I do not believe that if those duties were undertaken directly by a Government Department there would be anything but considerable dissatisfaction, among the people mainly concerned, at what they would conceive to be the prying of a central Government Department. Then the noble Viscount went on to speak of water and of the sometimes analogous substance milk, and the other matters with which the London County Council have to deal. One wonders exactly what it is with which the noble Viscount would like the body of which he is such an ornament to part. What would he like handed over to the central authority? The noble Viscount spoke somewhat severely of the fact that my right hon. friend Mr. Burns did not receive a deputation from the London County Council on the subject of housing. I am perfectly certain that my right hon. friend intended no discourtesy to that body. I assume he considered that his proposals would have the chance of being carefully considered by the London County Council as well as by Parliament before there was any question of their becoming law.

The noble Earl who initiated this debate dealt with the subject of local taxation in its broadest aspect. His complaint all through was that the burden was to a great extent placed upon the wrong shoulders. In reply to that we say that, as far as one half of it is concerned, that can only be dealt with by an improved system of valuation, that is to say, that so far as property which is at present subject to rates is concerned, valuation alone will properly allocate the burden to be borne by each class of property. It is equally true, however, that no system of valuation will deal with the other half of the noble Earl's complaint—that is that certain kinds of property do not, in his view, bear their proper share of burden. Personal property does not contribute. How does the noble Earl propose to deal with that? He proposes to broaden the basis of taxation, which might, perhaps, if I desired to be uncivil, be described as a shibboleth, but which I prefer to describe as a convenient Parliamentary phrase. Different people, I believe, attach different meanings to it. The meaning which I suppose the noble Earl attaches to it is the imposition of a duty for purposes of revenue—a small duty on a large number of imported articles. That is the interpretation which I assume the noble Earl places upon it. Nobody denies that it would be possible to raise a certain amount of revenue in that way; but you will not by that method get at the man you want to get at for this particular purpose. The man at whom I suppose the noble Earl wants to get is the man who has a million in Consols, lives in a flat, possibly keeps a yacht and a string of racehorses, and contributes a mere trifle to the rates. You will not get at him by broadening the basis of taxation. The only way of getting at him will be either by a graduated income tax or increased death duties. I do not see how that particular gentleman, or the other gentleman who is making £30,000 or £40,000 a year on the Stock Exchange and is living in a villa, can be got at in any other way. They can only be got at by some fiscal changes of the kind that I have indicated.

I will not dwell on the other points that have been mentioned, nor on the subject of compounding. I should merely like to confirm what my noble friend Lord Wolverhampton said—that we do attach the greatest importance to the Report of the Poor Law Commission in dealing with this whole subject. The noble Viscount who has just spoken rather twitted us with touching old-age pensions before receiving the Report of the Poor Law Commission, but if he will look at the Old-Age Pensions Bill he will see that there is no proposal in that measure which can in any way compromise or interfere with any proposition which the Commission may make. I desire to say this, because the point is a very obvious one to make by those who criticise the old-age pension scheme. With regard to Papers, perhaps the noble Earl will defer his request until I have had an opportunity of consulting Mr. Burns, when we will see what Papers and Returns can be produced so as to bring our information more up to date.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, I might perhaps be allowed to remind the House that in the concluding words of my speech in initiating this debate I specially said that I considered it to be no business of mine to point out to His Majesty's Government in what way the money should be raised by the Government which would undoubtedly be required for the purpose of making a very large contribution to the burdens now borne by the local ratepayers. That is a matter which I left entirely to His Majesty's Government. I am bound to state that I do not very much care how they find the money so long as they do find it. I need hardly say that in view of what the noble Earl opposite has just said, I do not intend to press my Motion for Papers, although I was profoundly disappointed when Lord Allendale told the House he was unable to comply with my request. I join with Viscount Wolverhampton in saying that the public servants of this country are not only extremely able but very willing, and I am certain that if His Majesty's Government thought fit to invite those who are quite capable of dealing with this subject in the way the noble Viscount did in 1893 to give their attention to it, the Blue-book might be brought up to date and would be a very valuable contribution to the subject. I mentioned in my speech in opening this debate that I was very largely indebted to a Return submitted to the Central Land Association by a gentleman in Gloucester. I only want that amplified and enlarged. That is quite within the power of Government officials, and I do not think it would involve any very large expense. I was, therefore, glad to hear the noble Earl say that if I would defer my request for the present and leave the matter in the hands of His Majesty's Government they would, nothwithstanding what was said by the noble Lord who represents the Local Government Board, do what they could to meet our request.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eight o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 25th June, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

King's College, London (Transfer) Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Tawe Valley Gas Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

London Port and Docks Bill (by Order). —Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. —Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Monday next.

Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland)

Act, 1899, relating to Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension," presented by Mr. Sinclair. read the first time; and ordered (under Section 9 of the Act) to be read a second time upon Monday, 6th July, and to be printed. [Bill 280.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords]; Bristol Tramways Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords]; Upton Town Hall Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [Lords].—Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP H).

Sir FREDERICK CAWLEY reported from the Committee on Group H of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 3).

Sir JOSEPH COMPTON-RICKETT reported from the Committee on Group 3 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Wednesday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to appoint special trustees in regard to certain land and premises of the Honourable Artillery Company; and for other purposes." [Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act for authorising and requiring the trustees of the will and codicils of the Hon. Frederick James Tollemache, deceased, to invest part of the trust funds and property in their hands, subject to the trusts of the said will and codicils, upon a transfer of a mortgage for two hundred and twenty-five thousand pounds created by the Right Hon. Ada Maria Katharine, Baroness Sudeley, the tenant for life under the said will and codicils, upon the security of her life interest under the said will and codicils and certain policies of assurance upon her own life; and for other purposes." [Tollemache Estate Bill [Lords].

Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords]; Tollemache Estate Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Crowthorne and other places, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour: From Briton Ferry; Bryn; Kenfig Hill; Kirkby in Furness; Nantymoel; Pontrhydyfen; Poole; Portsmouth; and, Skewen; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Order [24th June] that the Paper relative thereto be printed, read, and discharged.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Leyton Urban District Council, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4013, 4015, and 4043 to 4048 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 16, 1908).

Copy presented, of Agreement between the United Kingdom and Spain amending Article 5 of the Agreement of 25th November, 1875, respecting the Postal Service between Gibraltar and Spain. Signed at Madrid, 9th April, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 TO 1902 (PROCEEDINGS).

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Applications to and Proceedings of the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 to 1902, during the past year [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 198.]

CIVIL LIST PENSIONS.

Copy presented, of List of all Pensions granted during the year ended 31st March, 1908, and payable under the provisions of Section 9 (1) of the Civil List Act, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 199.]

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE.

Return ordered, "of the gross income and outgo of the Government of the United Kingdom in the year 1906–7, and a corresponding estimate for the year 1908–9, showing for each separate department or voted service the total income from all sources and the total outgo under all heads, including in italics receipts from or payments into the Exchequer and distinguishing between: (*a*) Sums raised by loan; (*b*) sums raised by taxation; (*c*) payments received from the public for services rendered, including postal revenue, court fees, fees for admission to museums, sales of publications, etc.; (*d*) payments received from, or an estimate of the value of unpaid services rendered to, other Government Departments; (*e*) rents, royalties, etc., received on account of Government property or Government monopolies; (*f*) sums received from sale of stores, etc.; (*g*) sums received for fines and penalties; (*h*) sums refunded; (*i*) sums received from local authorities; (*j*) sums received from other Governments; and distinguishing between payments charged on votes in Supply, payments charged upon the Consolidated Fund, and other payments, including the estimated value of services received from other Government Departments, and not paid for; and further showing whether such payments were devoted to reduction of debt, or to current expenditure, or to grants to local authorities or other Governments."—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Passages for Discharged Seamen from Continental Ports.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that seamen discharged from ships at Continental ports and repatriated to ports in the United Kingdom are not provided with proper accommodation on the passenger steamers; whether he is aware that the crew of the British steamer "Ragore" were sent from Antwerp to Harwich, and the seamen in question had no place to sleep in, and were unable to obtain any refreshments in the second-class accommodation, and that no accommodation is provided for third-class passengers on the Great Eastern steamers; and whether he will instruct consuls, when deciding the amount by which seamen will be repatriated, that proper accommodation is provided for the seamen who are being sent to the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I have received no complaint from the crew of the "Ragore," but I understand that the Great Eastern Railway Company decline to accept seamen except as third-class or deck passengers from Antwerp to Harwich. I am in communication with the company and will consider whether it is practicable to take further action in the matter, and will inform my hon. friend of the result.

Scottish Poor Rates.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can state what is the average poor rate for Scotland: and what have been the poor rates in the parishes of Barvas, Uig, and Lochs, in the Lews, and Tarbert, in Harris, for the years 1885, 1895, 1905, and 1908.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The average poor rate for Scotland in 1906–7 (the latest year for which statistics are available) was 11½d. per £. The actual poor rates levied were—

	1885.*	1895.	1905.	1907.
	s. d.	*s. d.*	*s. d.*	*s. d.*
Barvas - -	2 11	7 0	12 6	13 8
Uig - - - -	2 3	2 4	9 10	7 0
Lochs - - - -	4 2	6 4	12 6	12 3
Tarbert (Harris) - -	—	1 8	4 3	5 10

* The figures for 1885 include public health rate, which was then levied parochially along with the poor rate.

The figures for 1907 are given, as the official figures for 1908 are not available.

Burns Hartopp Estate, Kerry.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when the tenants on the Burns Hartopp estate at Caherdaniel, county Kerry, purchased some years ago by the Congested Districts Board, will be entitled to pay purchase annuities, in place of the old rents, which they are still paying; and can he state when it is expected that the road across the Coomnahorna bog will be completed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The estate in question was not vested in the Congested Districts Board until April last. A number of the tenants are taking advantage of the assistance offered by the Board for building and improving dwellings, and the resale of the estate will be completed as soon as this work is done. It is not the case that the tenants are paying the old rents; they have been paying interest at 3½ per cent. on their purchase-money since November, 1906. The Board have constructed two miles of road to the turf bog, but do not think it necessary to extend the road across the bog. Passages from the turf banks to the road will be cleared and drained.

Maybery Estate, Kenmare.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the evicted tenants on the Maybery estate, near Kenmare, have not yet been reinstated; can he explain the cause of the delay; and can he state approximately when they will be reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners made an offer to the owner for the purchase of five evicted holdings on the estate in question, but the owner declined to accept the price offered. The Commissioners have since had a fresh inspection made, and are now considering their inspector's report with a view to further action in the matter.

Coonana Pier, Kerry.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board is now in a position to provide a beacon light on the pier at Coonana, County Kerry; and whether, in view of the heavy labour necessitated by the use of large fishing boats, the Board will give some assistance in the procuring of a windlass for hauling up these boats.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Congested Districts Board hope within a few weeks to provide lamps on the Coonana Pier for the convenience of the fishermen, but they are not satisfied that a windlass would be suitable for use at that place.

The Law Courts.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he will consider the question of appointing a Select Committee to inquire into the existing accommodation of the Law Courts, with a view to ascertaining how far a rearrangement of courts and rooms might be made which would obviate the necessity of building upon the existing garden and open space.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) I regret that I am unable to adopt the proposal of my hon. friend. The question of accommodation has been considered very fully with the judicial authorities, and no rearrangement such as he suggests is possible.

Marble Arch Coffee Stall.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether his attention has been called to the removal of the coffee stall, which for fifty-two years has stood at the Marble Arch, and for the last eighteen years has been kept by L. G. Jeans; whether Jeans has been fined for obstructing the way; and whether, under the circumstances, another site will be allotted to him as was done in a similar case for the stallholders in St. James Park.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) This is a matter with which I am not concerned. It is purely a question for the police.

Steamship "Helga."

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he will state out of what fund the steamship "Helga" was provided for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The purchase and maintenance of the steam cruiser "Helga" have been provided for by the Department's endowment fund.

Grant for Irish Fishery Development.

MR. HUGH LAW: To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) if he will state what is the total sum provided for the protection and development of Irish sea and inland fisheries, respectively, by the Fisheries Section of the Department of Agriculture.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) By Section 16 (*d*) of The Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899, the sum of £10,000 per annum is allocated from the Department's endowment fund for the purposes of sea fisheries. About half of that sum is at present required for sea-police duties. No special funds are set aside by the Act for the purposes of inland fisheries; but, out of the surplus remaining after the several applications of the endowment fund, as provided for in Section 16 of the Act, have been met, grants are made from time to time to boards of conservators in aid of inland fisheries, with the concurrence of the Agricultural Board.

Cruisers for Irish Fishery Protection.

MR. HUGH LAW: To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he is aware that the Scottish Fishery Board are in receipt of £15,000 per annum, out of the Local Taxation Account of Scotland, for the maintenance of four fishery cruisers, and that, in addition to this, the Admiralty, under the Herring Fishery (Scotland) Act, place two cruisers at the disposal of the Fishery Board for police purposes; and whether any, and, if so, what, similar provision is made for the protection of Irish fisheries.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Department understand that the facts are as stated in the Question. The only provision of a similar character made in Ireland is that out of which the Department purchased and maintained their steam cruiser "Helga."

Irish Afforestry Inspector.

MR. MULDOON (Wicklow, E.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether Mr. Ellison, an inspector in the employment of the Department, has been discharged, and, if so, on what grounds; and whether it is proposed to again take this officer into the service of the Department when forestry work is commenced.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) Mr. Ellison was employed by the Department for certain work in connection with forestry under an engagement, dated June, 1904, which was terminable at any time by three months' notice. As the work for which he was employed was practically completed, and as no further investigations or extensive operations in regard to forestry involving any large expenditure were contemplated, the Department on 31st March last informed Mr. Ellison that they felt obliged to notify him that his engagement would terminate on 1st July next. Pending the decision of the Government in the matter of providing funds to enable the Department to extend their forestry operations, the Department are not in a position to reply to the latter portion of the Question.

Import and Export Trade Statistics.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether his attention has been called to the statement made, in the lately issued Report on Irish imports and exports for 1906, that until import and export Returns are available which specify the nature, weight, and value of goods, any figures put forward with regard to the import and export value of manufactured articles can only be regarded as approximate in character; and can he state what steps he proposes to take in order to secure real accuracy.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Department are aware of the statement referred to and are fully alive to the disadvantages under which their reports on exports and imports are compiled, but legislation is needed to enable the Department to obtain adequate Returns. This matter is at present under consideration.

Trawling in Sheephaven Bay.

MR. HUGH LAW: To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he has received information that a steam trawler has recently been trawling day and night in and about the entrance to Sheephaven Bay; whether complaints have been received of damage to fishermen's nets; and whether he will take steps to prevent a continuance of the practice.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) Steam trawling is at all times prohibited in Sheephaven between Breaghey Head and Rinnafagla. In the area between that line and a line from Norn Head to Rinnafagla it is not prohibited, save when large shoals of mackerel or herrings have set in there, and while boats are at such times using drift nets for the capture of these fish. No complaint of illegal trawling in Sheephaven, or of consequent injury to fishermen's gear, has been received. The Department, will, having regard to the means at their disposal, take all possible steps to see that the fishery laws and bye-laws are observed.

Limerick Competitions.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General, having regard to the result of the trial, Blyth *v.* Hulton, in the Court of Appeal last Friday, and particularly to the dictum of the learned Judge that a limerick competition, though designed to look like a trial of skill, is really nothing else than a lottery, what legislative or other steps he proposes to take to protect the public from fraud and to enforce the existing law against lotteries.

(*Answered by Sir William Robson.*) A Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament is now sitting to consider the present condition of the law as to lotteries and to report upon it, and upon the terms of this Report must depend the question whether any and what fresh legislation is requisite in the public interest.

Unclaimed Property.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether he will consider the desirableness of introducing legislation to make it compulsory upon bankers, solicitors, and others having in their possession property belonging to the estates of deceased persons, and having knowledge of their death, to disclose the fact of such possession to the executors.

(*Answered by Sir William Robson.*) Promises or pledges with regard to the introduction of legislation are beyond my scope. I hope also that legislation is scarcely necessary to compel bankers to disclose to the owners of property the fact that such property is in their possession as bankers.

Deptford Cattle Market.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the attention of the Board has been called to the fact that, owing to the shortage of American and Canadian cattle, no market was held at Deptford either on Monday or Wednesday of last week, and that already this year seventeen of the usual markets have not been held at Deptford; whether he has any official information showing that such shortage of cattle is due to a designed and regulated limitation of supplies rather than to an actual shortage; and whether the Board in the interests of British consumers will institute an inquiry.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board are aware that no market was held at Deptford on the days mentioned, and that during this year nineteen of the usual markets have not been held. An actual shortage of cattle imported from the United States and Canada undoubtedly exists, 19,000 fewer cattle having been landed at Deptford this year than last, but the Board have no information to show that this shortage is due to the cause suggested by my hon. friend. It is generally attributed to the present high price of maize and other feeding stuffs, and to local conditions temporarily affecting the trade in the United States. The Board do not consider that any specific inquiry would serve any useful purpose, but they will bear the suggestion in mind.

Imports of Foreign Cattle.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the Board of Agriculture, what are the numbers of cattle received at the foreign cattle markets for immediate slaughter from the United States and from Canada for the week ending 20th June; and what were the numbers from the same countries for the corresponding week last year.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The information for which my hon. friend asks is as follows—

Countries.	Week ended 20th June, 1908.	Week ended 22nd June, 1907.
	Number.	Number.
Canada - -	2,623	3,865
United States -	3,688	8,820

Prices of Beef.

MR. COOPER: To ask the hon Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the present increase in the price of English beef is consequential upon the increase of the price of American chilled beef, and not from any deficiency in the supply of the

English beef; and what steps the Board intend to take to secure a cheaper and more plentiful supply of beef.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) There is no evidence of any shortage in our Home supplies of beef, and the recent rise in prices appears to be due to the special conditions affecting our supplies from America at the present time. The Board will continue to do all they can to assist and encourage production.

Right of Speaking in Sheffield Public Parks.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.:) To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware of the sentence of two months imprisonment passed upon G. H. Fletcher by the Sheffield stipendiary for addressing meetings in the public parks; and whether, in view of the character of the sentence and Fletcher's previous good character, he will take steps to reduce the sentence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am making inquiries into this case, and I will inform the hon. Member of the result.

Manchester Education Conference.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been drawn to the resolutions agreed upon by the representative conference upon the education question recently held at Manchester; and whether he is prepared to introduce legislation upon the basis of the recommendations then made.

(*Answered by Mr. McKinnon Wood.*) The attention of my right hon. friend has been drawn to the resolutions referred to by the hon. Gentleman. While respecting the desire of those who agreed to the resolutions to arrive at terms which would bring the education controversy to an end, he regrets to have to express the opinion that the resolutions are administratively impossible and are open to such strong objection on principle that they are not likely to meet with substantial support.

Cost of Supervising Sugar Factories.

MR. VILLIERS (Brighton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the amount of the estimated State expenditure for the financial year ending 31st March, 1909, on account of the cost of supervising sugar factories in bond under the obligation imposed by the Sugar Convention, 1902; inasmuch as the grant of such expenditure is made to enable His Majesty to carry out the obligation of that Convention only, do His Majesty's Government propose to apply a portion of that grant to expenditure coming into payment after 1st September, 1908, at which date the Convention of 1902 is superseded by the Additional Act of 1907; and, if so, what authority have they, either from this House or from any Committee of this House, thus to apply the grant made for the purposes of the Sugar Convention, 1902, to the purposes of the Additional Act, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) No separate estimate of expenditure for supervising sugar refineries in bond is framed by the Customs Department. The present estimated annual cost to the Crown of such supervision is, however, £15,245. My hon. friend is under a misapprehension in supposing that the Sugar Convention of 1902 is superseded by the Additional Act of 1907. The obligation, under Article II. of the Convention, to place sugar refineries in bond remains in full force.

Collection of Licence Duties.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is proposed to employ Government officers in England and Wales to collect spirit licence duties and certain other licence duties, all for local taxation purposes, and at the same time to make it necessary for a local authority to employ officials to travel over the same areas to collect other licence duties also for local taxation purposes; and has it been considered whether this will lead to economy and efficient dispatch of business or the reverse.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) This matter has been fully considered, and

I am convinced that the changes contemplated will lead to economy and to a more efficient dispatch of business.

Reorganisation of the Revenue Service.

MR. SEARS: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the proposal to make important changes in the organisation of the Revenue services on the individual advice of certain officials, he will say whether such changes should be made, if at all, on the advice of the Boards of Inland Revenue and Customs; will he explain why it has apparently not been considered worth while to seek the advice of these Boards on matters vitally affecting the services which they are supposed to administer; will he state the duties and responsibilities discharged by these Boards and say whether any useful work is performed by them which cannot be undertaken equally well by the staff.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I must again refer my hon. friend to the Answer which I gave to the four Questions put by him on the 4th instant.

MR. SEARS: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what difference exists between the duties of the Revenue officers in England and in Scotland to require in the former case the transfer of certain licence duties to local authorities, whereas in the latter case no such transfer is considered necessary or desirable.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I beg to refer my hon. friend to the reply I made to a similar Question from the hon. Member for Hythe on Monday last.

Relief of the Unemployed.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what money has been decided upon as a grant towards the relief of the unemployed.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) No decision on the Question has as yet been reached.

Proof Spirit in Cider.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the percentage of proof spirit in ordinary English cider, and if it is more or less than the percentage in ordinary English light ale.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The proof spirit in English cider varies from as low as 2 to 11 per cent., but 5 to 7 per cent. may be regarded as a fair average. In ordinary English light ale the per centage of proof spirit varies from 6 to 11, but 7 to 8 per cent. may be considered a fair average for cheap light ale.

Unclaimed Bank Balances.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state on what grounds the Treasury objects to asking the Bank of England and the other banks of the three Kingdoms whether they are willing to supply voluntarily to Parliament statements showing in each case the total value of unclaimed balances since the foundation of the bank; the interest which would have accrued to each account if it had not been dormant; the total value of the drafts and bills of exchange remaining unpaid, and interest thereon; the value of bank notes issued and not presented for repayment, with interest thereon; the value of unclaimed stock and dividends held, with interest thereon; and the estimated value of the plate and other valuables held by the bank and unclaimed.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) As there is no power to compel the banks to make such a return, I am not prepared, as at present advised, to invite them to do it voluntarily.

Cost of Practice Ammunition at Glasgow.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that the County Association of Glasgow has lately increased the price for practice ammunition to the members of the Territorial Force, that the present charge incurs an outlay of 2s. for going over the range, and that the effect of this is bound to be to lower the standard of shooting in that neighbourhood; and whether, under the circumstances, he will give facilities to the association by which it may sell the ammunition at a lower price.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The General Officer Commanding has been requested to inquire into the matter.

15-Pounder Gun Shells.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the total number of shells for the newly-converted 15-pounder guns which will be made at Woolwich Arsenal this year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The present stock is sufficient for full equipment and for practice for some time. None, therefore, will be made this year at the Arsenal.

Artillery Practice — Efficiency Regulations.

MR. CARLILE: To ask the Secretary of State for War how many rounds will be fired per battery of the new converted 15-pounder gun to obtain efficiency; and what percentage of hits makes a first, or second, or third-class marksman in the Territorial Artillery.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) As regards the first part of the Question the allowance of ammunition per battery is 200 rounds annually, but no classification standard has yet been considered for the Territorial Artillery. As regards the second part of the Question, there is no such thing as a first, second, or third-class marksman in the artillery.

Territorial Artillery Officers.

MR. CARLILE: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the exact number of officers now serving or appointed, or to be shortly appointed, to the Territorial Artillery who have seen any war service as Artillery officers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The lists of approved officers have not yet been forwarded by the General Officers Commanding-in-Chief, and it is not, therefore, practicable at present to give the required information.

Boys at Woolwich Arsenal.

MR. CARLILE: To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the total number of boys now employed at the Woolwich Arsenal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) 1,677 boys are now employed at Woolwich Arsenal.

Yeomanry Pay.

MR. GUINNESS (Bury St. Edmunds): To ask the Secretary of State for War how many of the Yeomanry now serving are completing periods of enlistment under old rates of pay; and how many have joined under the new conditions as to pay.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Approximately 18,000 of the Yeomanry were on 1st June enlisted in the Territorial Force on old rates of pay and 1,000 on new rates of pay.

Colonel Smythe's Collinstown Estate.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the facts within the knowledge of the Estates Commissioners that the farm on Colonel Smythe's estate, Collinstown, Westmeath, from which Mrs. Riggs was evicted, is still vacant and on the landlord's hands, stands isolated some miles distant from the owner's demesne, has no connection with that demesne, and is not used or caable of being used as a home farm; that Mrs. Riggs' son, in exile for want of a home, desires to return to the evicted farm; and that Mrs. Riggs, in her duty to herself and her children, will not, after twenty-five years in a Land League hut, surrender her claim to restoration under the compulsory provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act of 1907, will he ascertain definitely when the Commissioners purpose to restore this evicted family.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave to his Question on this subject on 15th May last. On 1st instant the hon. Member was, I understand, informed by the Estates Commissioners that, as Mrs. Riggs has declined to accept the parcel of land offered to her, they have struck her name off their list, and will take no further action in her case.

Cahirciveen Evicted Tenant.

MR. BOLAND: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps, if any, have been taken to secure the reinstatement of Dennis Curran, now living in New Market Street, Cahirciveen, who was evicted from his holding on the estate of Mr. T. G. Williams, in the parish of Dromod, County Kerry.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have fully considered the aplication of Dennis Curran and have decided that they can take no action upon it.

Irish Teachers' Pay.

MR. MOONEY (Newry): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that some of the transition teachers are losing upwards of £40 annually by the operation of the rules of the Commissioners of National Education that came into force in 1900; and, if so, will he take steps to see that a portion of the forthcoming grant will be used to redress the grievances of this section of the teachers.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave on 3rd March last to a Question on this subject by the hon. Member for South Down, in which I stated that the teachers referred to have already received full consideration, and that each particular case has been dealt with on its merits. The Government, as at present advised, see no good reason to suggest any alteration in the manner of the disposal of the additional grant as indicated in the Supplementary Estimate now before Parliament.

Irish Intermediate Education Board.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the rules and programme of the Board of Intermediate Education in Ireland will be laid upon the Table of the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The rules and programme for 1909 were laid upon the Table on the 23rd instant.

Belfast Trams Committee's Report.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Report submitted to the Tramways and Electricity Committee of the Belfast Corporation on the 22nd instant, by Mr. C. E. Dyer, City Accountant; whether the report stated that in the half-yearly statement submitted in October last the outstanding unpaid bills were taken at £13,556, whereas they proved afterwards to have been £16,544, or a difference of £2,988, and that the item of power was also undercharged; and whether, in view of the dissatisfaction which exists in Belfast with the management and finance of the tramway system, he will take care that the Local Government Board is made fully aware of all the facts relating to the tramway accounts.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have not received a copy of the Report referred to, but they will call the attention of their auditor to the facts alleged in the Question.

American Gooseberry Mildew.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he can give the total number of outbreaks of American gooseberry mildew in the occurring stage which have occurred this year, and the counties in which they have severally occurred; and whether these outbreaks have occurred in plantations where the instructions of the Board as regards pruning in winter have been carried out.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) Seventy outbreaks of American gooseberry mildew in the summer stage have occurred this year in the following counties, viz.:—Herefordshire (2), Warwickshire (4), Norfolk (10), Isle of Ely (7), Worcestershire (13), and Huntingdonshire (34). With the exception of one outbreak in Herefordshire and another in Warwickshire all the cases have occurred in plantations where the disease appeared last year. They are probably due to imperfect pruning. I may add that fruit growers are now willingly complying with the requirements of our Orders and are taking all necessary steps to get rid of the disease.

Sheep Disease—Salving.

Mr. FULLERTON (Cumberland, Egremont): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has any official information showing that sheep are in the best possible condition of protection from parasitic attack when the old-established custom of salving is adopted by farmers; and, if so, whether he will see that no compulsion is exercised on farmers to dip their sheep in all cases where the sheep have been effectively salved.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Board raise no objection to the salving of sheep, but in view of the conclusions arrived at by the Departmental Committee on the dipping and treatment of sheep, and of the advice of their veterinary officers on this matter, the Board cannot regard it as such an effective precaution against sheep scab as dipping in an approved sheep-dip.

Bolton Telephonist's Grievance.

Mr. GILL (Bolton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a female telephonist at Bolton, who has been performing supervising duty for two years without any allowance, has now been passed over by a junior, who is to receive 4s. per week allowance; whether he is aware that the officer passed over has not had a single complaint or irregularity urged against her, and that the only reason given to her is that she is too friendly with the staff; and whether he will make full inquiry into the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have received no appeal from the telephonist concerned. I am fully aware of the circumstances of the case, and am satisfied that no injustice was done.

Tobacco Manufacture Regulations.

Mr. WATT: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the quantities of tobacco permitted to be manufactured under the various licence duties ranging from £5 5s. to £31 10s.; the total amounts derived from licence duties to wholesale tobacco manufacturers during the last seven years; whether the number of firms paying these is much reduced in that time; and whether he will continue the graduation of taxation up to a much higher poundage.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The quantities of tobacco permitted to be manufactured under the various rates of licence duty are as follows—

Licence Duty.		lbs.
£5 5s.	not exceeding	20,000
£10 10s.	,,	40,000
£15 15s.	,,	60,000
£21 0s.	,,	80,000
£26 5s.	,,	100,000
£31 10s.	exceeding	100,000

The following is a statement of the number of licences granted, and the net receipt of duty from such licences in the seven years ended 31st March, 1908—

Year.	Number of licenses issued.	Duty.
		£
1901–2 - -	502	6,846
1902–3 - -	482	6,435
1903–4 - -	464	6,079
1904–5 - -	441	5,843
1905–6 - -	429	5,460
1906–7 - -	415	5,486
1907–8 - -	415	5,408

It is not considered advisable to continue the graduation to a higher rate.

Customs Duties on Hops.

Mr. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will state what are the Customs duties imposed upon hops in various foreign countries, together with the corresponding Excise duties, if any.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) The rates of import duty imposed on hops in various foreign countries are stated at page 571 of the Return "Foreign Import Duties, 1907" (Cd. 3859). I am not aware that Excise duties are levied on hops in any of the principal hop-producing countries.

1st Argyll and Bute Volunteer Artillery.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire): To ask the Secretary of State for War when the full complement of guns will be delivered to the 1st Argyll and Bute Royal Garrison Artillery (Volunteers): whether he is aware that the two guns already delivered were delivered without pack-saddles and fittings; whether he is now in a position to say what the allowance will be for officers' uniform; and whether he will consider the advisability of allowing for the insurance of the men against accidents likely to occur when dealing with untrained horses.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The full number of guns will be issued when the corps is ready to receive them. The pack saddlery is not yet ready, but it is hoped will be ready for issue by the end of the month. As regards uniform, I have already explained to the House that the amount of the expenditure on uniform on transfer will be granted up to a sum of £20 under the conditions laid down in Army Order of 18th March, 1908. As regards accidents, compensation will be granted as laid down in Paragraph 105 of Part II. of the same Army Order.

Bechuanaland Expedition Reward.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has under consideration the award of a medal or some other decoration for the officers, non-commissioned officers, and men who took part in the Bechuanaland expedition of 1884–5; and, if so, when the distribution is likely to take place and, seeing the length of time which has already taken place, if he will do what he can to expedite it.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The grant of a medal for this expedition was refused by my predecessors on the grounds that there were no active operations to justify it. I see no reasons for departing from this decision.

Woolwich Arsenal—Compensation Case.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether an increased compensation allowance can be granted to William Edward Ansell, a painter in the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, who was incapacitated by falling from a scaffold whilst at work at the projectile store in 1905; and, if not, whether he will take steps to increase the allowance of 2s. 8d. a week under the circumstances.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The allowance of 2s. 8d. a week was fixed as the result of the medical examinations which took place in July, 1906, March, 1907, and March, 1908. It was found at all three examinations that his capacity was only slightly impaired by the accident. The allowance is based on these examinations and his average weekly earnings before the accident.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Fires on Admiralty Property.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will state approximately the value of Government property and premises destroyed or damaged by fire during the last two years.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): As I have stated, the Admiralty do not insure their property against fire, and therefore there are no statistics very readily available to enable me to assist the hon. Member; but I have looked through the reports of the cases of fire that have occurred at Admiralty establishments in the United Kingdom during the last two years, and I think I can safely say that the amount of damage does not exceed £10,000.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: How many fires would be involved in that loss of £10,000?

Mr. McKENNA: Not many, but I cannot charge my memory with the exact number.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): Any galley fires among them?

[No Answer was returned.]

H.M.S. "Commonwealth."

Mr. LAMONT (Buteshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how long H.M.S. "Commonwealth" was in dock after grounding on Hamilton Spit, in the Island of Arran, and what was the cost of effecting the necessary repairs.

Mr. McKENNA: The "Commonwealth" was docked at Devonport for repairs after grounding, on 30th August, 1907, and undocked on the 4th October, 1907. The grounding took place on the 23rd August, 1907. No separate account was kept of the expenditure incurred in making good the damage referred to, but the estimated cost of the work was £3,450; and from a return of expenditure which includes the cost of the work in question, there seems no reason to suppose that the actual expenditure was in excess of this estimate.

Dockyard Employees and the Territorial Army.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it is the intention of the Government to give facilities to men employed in naval dockyards to join the Territorial Army.

Mr. McKENNA: As far as the Admiralty are concerned, no obstacle will be placed in the way of dockyard men who wish to join the Territorial Army.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): And in the event of the mobilisation of the Territorial Force how will the work of the dockyards go on?

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT: Are the men aware of the views of the Admiralty on this point?

Mr. McKENNA: I assume that the fact is known in the dockyards. I replied to a similar Question on 1st June, and no doubt the answer was reported.

Aden Guard Ships.

Mr. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty for what periods during the last year British guard ships have been withdrawn from the port of Aden; whether he will inquire if their absence has resulted in an increase of the slave trade in the southern part of the Red Sea; and whether he will make arrangements for the guard ships to be again stationed there.

Mr. McKENNA: There is no permanent guard ship at Aden; but one of His Majesty's ships on the East Indian station is generally there. During the last year Aden has been without a ship for a period of five months, an unusually long period, for which there were exceptional reasons. No information has been received which would point to an increase of the slave trade having taken place in the southern part of the Red Sea, but inquiries will be made on this point. The movements of His Majesty's ships are determined by the requirements of the service, and any circumstances requiring the presence of a ship at Aden will be duly taken into account by the Commander-in-Chief.

Returns of Naval Casualties.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if the Board will grant a Return of casualties to warships such as has been issued for many years past.

Mr. McKENNA: This matter has been the subject of long and careful consideration, and the conclusion we have come to is that we should not continue in this or future years to publish a Return of casualties to ships, the completeness of which it is impossible to guarantee.

Mr. ASHLEY: In view of the necessity for discussing the administration of the present Board of Admiralty, will the Prime Minister take steps to allot the usual number of days for Navy Votes, instead of cutting them short?

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): I must ask for notice of that Question.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): When the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty says it is impossible to guarantee a complete casualty Return, is he not aware that there are three separate ways in which all casualties come before the Admiralty? It is the duty of the admiral in the first place, by regulation, to report to the Admiralty, then, secondly, all the collisions have to be logged, and copies of the log sent on; and, finally, the accounts for all repairs must be passed by the Admiralty.

MR. McKENNA: No one is better aware than the hon. and gallant Member that many of the casualties are of such a trifling nature that they do not call for dockyard repairs, and are not, in fact, reported to the Admiralty. Consequently, there would be no opportunity for including them in the Return to which the hon. Member refers.

MR. BELLAIRS: But is it not the duty of the officer in command to log and report every collision and every grounding?

MR. McKENNA: Yes; but the collision may be of a kind which the captain may think it unnecessary to report to the Admiralty, and he does not do so.

MR. BELLAIRS: Then I give notice that I will call attention to this matter upon the Navy Estimates. I will then cite cases where vessels have been repaired in dockyards, but which were not included in the Return. Did not the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty promise a Return for this year when he said His Majesty's ship "Angler" would be included in the 1908 Return?

MR. McKENNA: At that time the form of the Return was under consideration by the Board, who have now come to the conclusion that it is undesirable to continue to publish the Return.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): Can we have a Return of all cases where dockyard repairs are necessary?

MR. McKENNA: I will consider that point.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): But is it not the fact that this Return has been ordered by the House of Commons?

MR. McKENNA: It was only ordered for the year.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Is it going to be presented for this year?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. There have been, I think, seven supplementary Questions to this one Question; and as these are 112 Questions on the Paper, I think others should have a chance.

Cane Sugar Production.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can give the statistics of the average production of cane sugar in India and in the West Indies for the five years preceding and the five years succeeding the introduction of the countervailing duties in India.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): Statistics of the production of sugar in India before 1899, when countervailing duties were first introduced, are not available. The Return made to this House by the Board of Trade in August, 1907, No. 344, shows the sugar production of India since that year, and also of the several West India Islands since 1887.

Disloyal Bengali Students.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether certain Bengali students holding Government scholarships at the Royal Agricultural College at Cirencester wore in the classrooms medals in celebration of the Indian Mutiny; and, if so, whether they were ordered to remove such medals; and whether they continue to hold the Government scholarships.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State understands from the Principal of the College that certain Indian students did appear in the classrooms wearing a medal with a disloyal inscription. They are not Bengalis, nor do they hold Government scholarships. The matter has been dealt with by the Principal in exercise of his disciplinary authority.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): Are we to understand that the practice has been definitely put a stop to?

MR. BUCHANAN: I hope so.

Calcutta Model Liquor Shops.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the recommendation of the Calcutta Excise Committee in favour of the acquisition of sites and the construction, at the cost of the Government, of a certain number of model buildings to be used as liquor shops; whether he will state the conditions upon which the proposal has been accepted by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal; and whether, in view of the direct implication of the Government in the liquor trade which such a scheme involves, he is in a position to state that the experiment will be confined to a limited area, and will not be regarded as a precedent for general application.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has seen the Report referred to. The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal has directed that the proposal in question may be acted on in special cases, in which it is impossible otherwise to have proper sanitary safeguards, and an adequate supervision over the traffic. The sites chosen will be chosen with a view foster the traffic, but to control it. The experiment is confined to the Calcutta area, the conditions of which are quite exceptional.

Poppy Cultivation in China.

MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, having regard to the recent rescript of the Government of China ordering the entire cessation of the growth of poppy and the manufacture of opium therefrom throughout that Empire within two years, and in view of the declared policy of His Majesty's Government to proceed *pari passu* with China in restricting the opium traffic, the Secretary of State for India will give orders that the planting of poppy in India during the coming autumn shall be materially further restricted.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State is not aware that a rescript abolishing poppy cultivation and opium production throughout China within two years was recently issued.

New Indian Press Law.

*DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he will state what is the meaning of the words conditional order in the Indian Press Act VII., of 1908; what are the conditions to which such an order is subject; and whether its effect is to attach the Press or in any way to interfere with the publication of an offending newspaper before the persons concerned have been afforded the opportunity of appearing before the magistrate to show cause why the order should not be made absolute.

*MR. REES: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers this Question, may I ask him whether indeed there is not yet time to make concessions in favour of those, who, after all, only incite others to murder our compatriots in India?

MR. BUCHANAN: I do not think the Question necessarily implies concessions to anybody. The words "conditional order" indicate that the order will not be capable of execution until it is made absolute. The effect of such an order is not of itself to attach the Press or interfere with the publication of a newspaper before the appearance directed by the order; such attachment would require a separate order under subsection (3) of Section 3.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, under the new Indian Press Act, in cases of emergency power is given to a single magistrate, who need not be a barrister, to attach by a summary order newspapers and printing-presses without the proprietors or editors having been heard in their own defence; whether the Act provides who is to be the judge of the emergency; and whether there is any appeal to the High Court against such an order.

MR. BUCHANAN: The text of the Act is in the hon. Member's hands and he is responsible for the paraphrase given in the first part of his Question. The magistrate to whom the application is made is the judge of the emergency. If, on the hearing of the case, the magistrate is not satisfied under Section 3 (6) of the Act he will set aside the order of attachment. An appeal lies by Section 5 to the High Court against any order of forfeiture which may follow upon attachment, and if the appeal is successful the order of attachment falls to the ground.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether under the new Indian Press Act, where an order absolute has been made by a single magistrate forfeiting a newspaper and printing-press, the order becomes, in all cases, operative in spite of an appeal to the High Court having been lodged by the defendant; and, if so, whether the Secretary of State will take steps to expedite the hearing of such appeals, and to provide that they be heard by a Court of not less than three Judges.

MR. BUCHANAN: It is open to the High Court on receiving an appeal to suspend or otherwise to modify, pending the hearing of the appeal, any order of forfeiture. It is the invariable custom of the High Courts to deal promptly with criminal appeals, and no steps are necessary in order to expedite the hearing. It is not considered necessary to provide that appeals shall be heard by a Court of not less than three Judges.

Indian Frontier War Medals.

CAPTAIN ARTHUR MURRAY (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that a large number of officers and men engaged in the recent operations against the Zakka Khel and Mohmands ar already in possession of the 1895 Indi Medal (Queen's Head); whether it is th intention of the Government to recommend that a medal be granted to the troops engaged in those operations; and, if so, whether the Government will bear in mind the precedent established in connection with the granting of medals for service in Africa during His Majesty's reign, and will recommend that a King's Head Medal with distinctive ribbon be granted to all engaged in the operations referred to.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Answer to the first portion of this Question is in the affirmative. As regards the other portions, I am not in a position to make any statement.

Union of the West Indian Colonies.

MR. LAMONT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government, in view of the growth of opinion in favour of federation or unification of the West Indian Colonies since the matter was last debated in this House on 17th May, 1905, will consider the advisability of appointing a Royal Commission to inquire into the advantages of, and the desire of the inhabitants for, such a policy and the means by which it could best be carried into effect.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): The Secretary of State desires me to say that the question of closer union between the West Indian Colonies is engaging his attention, and that he will not fail to consider the suggested appointment of a Royal Commission when he has further studied the social, economic, and political conditions of those Colonies.

Dinizulu.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state when he will be in a position to make a full statement respecting the proposed new Court to be constituted for the trial of Dinizulu; and whether he has yet received official information as to the date when the preliminary investigation will be brought to a close.

COLONEL SEELY: We are informed officially that the Attorney-General of Natal expects the preliminary examination to be finished within the next six weeks; and that in the event of the magistrate committing Dinizulu for trial, the Government will make every effort consistent with the requirements of the defence to expedite the commencement of the proceedings.

Kingston Port.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will at once communicate with the Governer of Jamaica with reference to the desirability of taking advantage of the present opportunity, in the rebuilding of Kingston, Jamaica, to provide modern facilities in the port, and connect the Government railway with all the wharves.

COLONEL SEELY: The Governor of Jamaica was in England very recently and the opportunity was then taken to discuss the question with him. He is known to have it under his consideration, and we are simply waiting for his advice. In these circumstances I do not think that the communication suggested by the hon. Member is necessary.

Employment of Ceylonese.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the determination of His Majesty's Government to employ natives in preference to Englishmen in Ceylon is confined to that island, or whether this policy is to be extended to all Crown Colonies.

COLONEL SEELY: What I stated on Tuesday in reply to the question of my hon. friend the Member for East Nottingham, was that it was the policy of the Ceylon Government and of successive Secretaries of State to pay every consideration to the claims of well-qualified Ceylonese to appointments in the Public Works Department of that Colony, and to give them a certain preference over Europeans with equal but not better qualifications. Similar questions in respect of other Colonies must, of couse, be decided in accordance with the particular circumstances of each Colony.

MR. ASHLEY: Is the same principle of giving preference to natives to be extended to all the Crown Colonies?

COLONEL SEELY: I cannot add anything to what I have said. I believe it is the view that the natives of our Colonies should have some share in the administration, and this has been the policy of successive Secretaries of State.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are we exploiting Ceylon for the benefit of Englishmen only?

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Is the proper term to use "Cingalese" or "Ceylonese?"

[No Answer was returned.]

Congo Trade—Native Rights.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can inform the House if the right of natives of the Congo to trade in any part of the Congo with merchants of all nationalities, named in the despatch dated 27th March last, as one of the changes required by His Majesty's Government in recognising a Belgian annexation of the Congo, is to be understood as applying to such articles as wild rubber, copal, and ivory, in which the natives are now debarred from trading, on the plea that these articles are the property either of the administration or of the concessionaires.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): His Majesty's Government contend that all concessions should be subject to native rights; that the natives must not be debarred from the enjoyment of the fruits of the soil in all territory owned or occupied by them; and that their right to trade in any part of the Congo extends to such articles as those mentioned in the Question. But ivory, it is generally recognised, may be the subject of special regulations to prevent extermination of elephants.

Russian Sugar Exports.

Mr. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can explain what the effect is of the reservation made by Sir Arthur Hardinge on behalf of His Majesty's Government that, although he had signed the Protocol of 19th December, 1907, restricting the export of Russian sugar, and thereby equally limiting the amount importable into this country, he nevertheless did not thus assent to the stipulation tending to restrict the exportation of Russian sugar.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The reservation referred to by the hon. Member was made in order to define the attitude of His Majesty's Government towards the provisions of the Protocol. If no such declaration had been made, the signature affixed to the Protocol on behalf of His Majesty's Government might have been held to imply an acknowledgment of an obligation on the part of Great Britain, if called upon, to take part in action designed to secure that Russia should fulfil her obligations under Article 3 of the Protocol, or in an inquiry as to whether she was, in fact, at any future time, fulfilling these obligations. The declaration made it clear that His Majesty's Government were not prepared to participate in such proceedings. As I have already explained, His Majesty's Government regarded the arrangement as one which was not dependent on their consent, which could have been made without their consent, and which it was not in their power to prevent. They therefore considered that the utmost they could do was to free themselves from any possible obligation to close their ports to Russian sugar, which they have done by the declaration in question.

Trawling in the Moray Firth.

Mr. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether arrangements have yet been made with the Foreign Governments concerned to put a stop to trawling in the Moray Firth before the fishery grounds are destroyed; and, if not, can he say what steps are being taken in the matter.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer returned by me to the hon. Member for Elgin Burghs on the 4th instant, to which I have nothing to add.

Mr. MORTON: Bearing in mind the great importance of this to thousands of fishermen in the north of Scotland, will the right hon. Baronet expedite matters so that something may be settled?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I am desirous of doing so, but there are several interests to be considered.

Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): Is it not a Department of our own administration with which the difficulty has arisen?

Sir EDWARD GREY: The Departments concerned are discussing the question with the object of deciding what representations can be made to foreign countries in the interest of this country.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Can the right hon. Baronet hold out any hope that this matter will be satisfactorily settled within the next twelve months?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I hope sooner than that.

Great Britain and Montenegro.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs why, in view of the friendly relations which have always existed between Great Britain and Montenegro, this country remains the only one of the great Powers without a Legation at the Montenegrin capital.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The absence of a Legation of His Majesty at Cettinje is due simply to the fact that the amount of diplomatic business to be transacted with the Montenegrin Government does not appear sufficient to justify the expenditure required for the maintenance of such an establishment. The present arrangement whereby the councillor of His Majesty's Embassy at Rome acts as *Charge d'Affaires*, and resides at Cettinje temporarily whenever his services are required, has proved satisfactory.

Great Britain and Servia.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British Minister at Belgrade maintains intimate personal relations with the Servian regicides, in violation of the assurances given that such relations would be carefully avoided; and whether, in view of the evidence laid before the State trial at Cettinje, implicating the Servian Crown and Government in a plot to assassinate the Prince of Montenegro and his family, the Government will consider the propriety of again severing diplomatic relations with Servia.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer to the first part of the hon. Member's Question is in the negative. With regard to the second part, His Majesty's Government are in possession of no evidence of the nature alluded to, and have no intention of making any change in the diplomatic relations existing between the two countries.

The Khedive's Visit.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the present visit of the Khedive to this country is of an official character; and whether His Majesty's Government proposes to discuss with the Khedive the petition, bearing more than 40,000 signatures, recently presented to him by Mohammed Farid Bey, leader of the Egyptian Nationalist Party, praying for the grant of a Constitution and a representative Assemby to Egypt.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The visit of the Khedive is of a private and not of an official character, and I can therefore make no official statements about it.

MR. KETTLE: Does the right hon. Baronet say that questions of international politics are never discussed in a private visit of one Sovereign to another?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I did not say that. I said I could make no official statement.

The Ghezira Rebellion—Abdul Kader's Fate.

MR. KETTLE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what were the respective dates of the trial and execution of Abdul Kader, leader of the rebellion at Ghezira, in the Soudan; was he allowed any appeal; whether the sentence included confiscation of Abdul Kader's property; and, if so, whether there was any proof that his family were implicated in the matters for which he was convicted.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Abdul Kader was tried on 8th May before a Civil Court, in accordance with the Soudan Penal Code, and was found guilty of murder and rebellion. He first invited Mr. Scott-Moncrieff and an Egyptian officer to interview him, and then murdered them in cold blood; and subsequently made an attack upon the Government forces which resulted in the death of two officers and several men. I am not aware that there is any right of appeal in such cases. The sentence included confiscation of his property. I do not know what members of his family were implicated. He is, so far, the only person who has been executed.

MR. KETTLE: What were the dates of the trial and execution?

SIR EDWARD GREY: He was tried on 8th May. I forget the exact date of the execution; it was shortly after.

MR. KETTLE: Was it not a week after.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I will inquire.

Flogging Sentences in Egypt.

MR. KETTLE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a policeman, by name Mohammed Elal, of Abdin district, was on 19th March last sentenced to twenty-five lashes and nine months imprisonment for accepting a bribe of 4 piastres, equivalent to about 10d.; if so, whether he will instruct the

British agent in Egypt to recommend the discontinuance of flogging for slight offences, and in this instance the release of the prisoner; and whether he can say if all information with regard to this case was withheld from the Press, although a bureau for the dissemination of official news exists in Egypt.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information as to the alleged occurrence. I have no reason whatever to suppose that the disciplinary measures taken by the Egyptian Government to secure efficiency and prevent abuses in the police force are excessive or that there is any justification for interfering with their discretion in the matter.

MR. KETTLE: Will the right hon. Baronet cause inquiries to be made into this particular case?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No, Sir, not unless I have reason to suppose anything occurred which would justify our intervention.

The Fighting in Persia.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received any information as to the recent fighting in Teheran and unrest in Persia; and whether he is taking any steps to protect the lives, property, and interests of British subjects.

SIR EDWARD GREY: On the 23rd His Majesty's *Charge d'Affaires* at Teheran reported that the Shah had sent twenty Cossacks to arrest eight persons in a mosque which adjoins the Assembly House. The arrest was refused, and a shot was fired from the mosque. Guns were then used by the Shah's troops and a number of people killed. A further telegram of the 23rd stated that some twelve of the alleged leaders of the popular party had been arrested, including Seyyid Abdulla. The Assembly buildings and mosque had been cleared by the Shah's troops. The Assembly building, some shops and houses, including that of the Zil es Sultan, had been pillaged and a state of siege proclaimed. The Anjumens had dispersed. The losses among the troops amounted to forty men; on the other side they were unknown, but reported to be small. The military *Attache* reported that the town was quiet, and there was as yet no signs of refugees taking "bast" in the British Legation. On the 23rd the Russian Minister and the British *Charge d'Affaires* sent their dragomans to the Shah to recall to His Majesty the assurances he had given in December, and to suggest that he should issue a proclamation announcing that he had no desire to abolish the Constitution; they also requested that the most stringent measures should be taken to maintain order and protect Europeans. The Shah, in reply to these requests, gave full assurances and ordered that special protection should be afforded to the telegraphs and the Imperial Bank of Persia. Yesterday Mr. Marling telegraphed that Teheran was quiet, and that he did not expect danger for Europeans. A number of refugees, including a deputy and five journalists, had, however, taken "bast" in the Legation. The Shah had arrested on the night of the 23rd thirty prominent members of the opposing party, mostly members of the Anjumens and journalists. The British and Russian Governments have instructed their representatives at Teheran to warn the Zil es Sultan against intriguing against the throne, and also to inform the Shah that any hostile action against the Medgliss and the Constitutional Party would receive no support from them.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): May I ask whether the Russian officer who was in command of the Shah's troops during the events which culminated in the destruction of the Parliament House is now responsible for the maintenance of order in Teheran, and whether this officer and the other Russian officers in the Persian service are on the active list of the Russian army?

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Russian, or any officer in command of Persian troops, is under the orders of the Persian Government, who are responsible for the maintenance of order in Teheran. I do not know whether the officer referred to or others are on the active list of the Russian Army; probably they are in the same way as British officers are sometimes seconded for service in a foreign country.

Seizure of a British Subject by Moors at Tetuan.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received any report of the alleged seizure of Mr. Clark Kennedy, a British subject, by Moors, near Tangier; and what action His Majesty's Government intend to take in the matter.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received information of the capture of Mr. Clark Kennedy, a British subject, by Moorish brigands near Tetuan; and what steps will be taken to procure his release.

Sir EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's Government have received no information beyond the bare fact of Mr. Clark Kennedy's capture. The British *Charg d'Affaires* at Tangier has reported that he and the Vice-Consul at Tetuan are taking steps to secure his release.

Mr. ASHLEY: Are we to understand that the declaration of His Majesty's Government that they are not responsible for the payment of ransom in the case of Raisuli's captures still holds good?

Sir EDWARD GREY: Certainly it holds good. It is intended as a warning that if people go to dangerous places they do so at their own risk. But in the case of a British subject being captured we should use what influence is in our power to obtain his release.

Hamilton Spit Light.

*Mr. LAMONT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will state the estimated cost of the lighted buoy to be placed by the Northern Lights Commissioners at Hamilton Spit, in the Island of Arran.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Kearley, Devonport): The estimated cost of establishing the proposed gas lights buoy off Hamilton Spit is £350.

*Mr. LAMONT: May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether, if this small expenditure had been incurred when I called the attention of the Board of Trade to the subject by means of a Question in March last year we should not have saved the £3,450 which it cost to repair H.M.S. "Commonwealth."

District Railway Carriage Doors.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to frequent complaints on the part of travellers on the District Railway arising out of the confusion, delays, and inconvenience attending the use of sliding doors, which are also alleged to constitute a serious danger to the travelling public; and, if so, whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

Mr. KEARLEY: The Board of Trade are informed by the railway company that they are preparing to change all the present pneumatic apparatus controlling the movement of the doors, so that the doors can be worked by hand.

United Kingdom Pilots Association.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in fulfilment of the promise given by his predecessor in office during the debate on the Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill on 1st August last, he will meet the pilots of this country; and whether he will receive a deputation from representatives of the United Kingdom Pilots Association, who will be present in London on 2nd July for the purposes of their Annual Conference.

Mr. KEARLEY: My right hon. friend has, I understand, already intimated to the Association that he will be happy to receive the proposed deputation on 2nd July.

Railway Rates for Beef.

Mr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what are the rates per ton charged by the railway companies for the carriage of meat from Glasgow, Aberdeen, Birkenhead, Manchester, Chester, Birmingham, and Norwich to the London Central Meat Market; and whether any reduction in rate is allowed by the railway companies to firms sending chilled and frozen meat from any of these towns which has been imported from America.

MR. KEARLEY: The Board of Trade have asked the railway companies concerned for this information and will communicate with my hon. friend when they have received it.

Central Unemployed Committee.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has recently received a statement from the late superintendent of the women's workroom, at the Browning Settlement, Walworth Road, S.E., setting forth the circumstances of her dismissal by the Central Unemployed Committee, Women's Section, and appealing for an inquiry at his hands; whether he is aware that she alleges that the main charge of inefficient administration brought against her is entirely unfounded, and adduces proof in support; whether he is aware that the committee has refused to give her a hearing; and will he reconsider his refusal to investigate.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. MASTERMAN, West Ham, N.): The facts are generally as stated in the Question. The appointment and dismissal of the officers of the Central (Unemployed) Body for London is not a matter which is subject to any control on the part of the Local Government Board, and the Board could not undertake to investigate the complaint referred to.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Do the Local Government Board refuse to inquire into this matter, which involves not payment of the money but justice?

MR. MASTERMAN: The officials of the Central Unemployed Committee do not take their appointments subject to the control of the Local Government Board.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: But surely the Local Government Board has some influence with the Committee to see that justice is done?

MR. MASTERMAN: We have no reason to think that justice has not been done.

Imported Skimmed Milk.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a considerable portion of the condensed skim milk which is unfitted for the feeding of infants comes from Holland and Belgium; whether he can say what proportion of the 907,983 cwts. imported, according to the Returns, in 1906 came from these countries respectively; whether he is aware that it was established by the evidence given before the Butter Committee that in these countries a widespread system of scientific adulteration of butter and other dairy produce intended for exportation was carried on; and whether any steps are being taken, or will be taken, by the Board to inspect and analyse at the ports of entry or other places samples of this condensed milk.

MR. MASTERMAN: I am aware that a considerable portion of the condensed skimmed milk imported into this country comes from the Netherlands. Not much appears to come from Belgium. The quantity of condensed milk imported in 1906 from the Netherlands was 638,004 cwts., and from Belgium, 46,371 cwts. These quantities, like the 907,983 cwts. mentioned in the Question, comprise every class of imported condensed milk, and not merely condensed milk which is separated or skimmed. I am not aware that there is a widespread system of scientific adulteration in Holland and Belgium as respects condensed skimmed milk. The article itself is very cheap. Samples are taken at the ports by the Customs officers, with a view to preventing condensed skimmed milk from being introduced without being properly labelled, and the Local Government Board have lately prepared Regulations under the Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Act of last session, which have already been issued in draft, and which provide for unsound food of all kinds being examined and dealt with at the port of entry.

Mr. FLYNN: I have given the President of the Local Government Board a large amount of information on this. Is the hon. Gentleman aware that a large proportion of this condensed skimmed milk contains anything from 30 to 37 per cent. of beet sugar for the purpose of preservation and that such an amount is deleterious to human health—particularly in the case of invalids and children?

Mr. MASTERMAN: I am aware it is deleterious for infants, and probably a case may be made out for issuing a regulation calling public attention to the fact.

Territorial Army-Allowances for Substitution.

Mr. GRETTON (Rutland): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that in some cases under the new regulations Post Office employees who attend the encampments of the Territorial Forces will be required to pay more for substitutes at the Post Office than they would themselves receive as Post Office salary or wages during the period of the training; is he aware that no similar cases occurred under the Volunteer system; and will he so amend the Regulations that no employee under him will be a loser in excess of his pay from the fact that he attends an encampment of the Territorial Forces.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I am glad to be able to inform the hon. Member that, under the Regulations, as now authorised by the Treasury, the hardship indicated in the Question has been removed. No Post Office employee who receives special leave for training with the Territorial Forces will be required to pay towards the cost of his substitute any sum in excess of the amount of his civil pay.

Early Morning Trains for Postal Employees.

Mr. WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the difficulty that a number of postal servants employed at St. Martin's-le-Grand, and living in the North of London, experience in getting to work at 5 a.m., seeing that the first train of the morning service is due to arrive at Aldersgate Street at 5.8 a.m.; and whether he will take up the matter with the Great Northern Railway Company with a view to getting them to run the train earlier, or to run another train to the City which would enable the men to get to work at 5 a.m.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: No representation has been made to me on this subject. Post Office servants not infrequently apply through their associations, or direct, to the railway companies, when they think a case can be made out for additional or earlier train services.

Mr. WARDLE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that representations have already been made to the companies, and that there are over 1,000 postal employees who live in the North of London?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: If any representations are made to me, I will inquire into them.

Unclaimed Deposits in Scotch Banks.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that large sums of money are held by the Scottish banks on deposit receipts; that many of the thrifty of the working class invest their savings in that way; that the loss or mislay of the receipt destroys all evidence of the transaction except the evidence of the books of the banks; that no effort whatever is made by the banks to find the owners of these sums or their representatives; and that, ultimately, the money goes to enrich the shareholders of the banks; and whether, under these circumstances, he will institute a Departmental Inquiry into this matter.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire): I am aware that considerable sums are invested in the manner described by my hon. friend, and I will cause inquiry to be made regarding the points raised in the latter part of the Question.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): Does the right hon. Gentleman accept the statement that the banks make no efforts to find the owners of these sums——

MR. SINCLAIR: I have said I will inquire.

MR. WATT: May I ask——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Really, I think other hon. Members who have Questions on the Paper should have some chance.

School Attendance in Stornoway.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state under what circumstances the father of a child living at Upper Bayble, Island of Lewis, has been summoned by the School Board of Stornoway to appear before the Sheriff for not sending his child to school, seeing that the child is under six years of age, and that she would have to walk six miles a day if she returned home for the midday meal.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Department have no information on the subject, and in any case the matter is one for the decision of the Sheriff and not of the Department.

Scottish Fisheries—Steam-Propelled Vessels.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that out of 1,103 steam-propelled vessels engaged in the Scottish fisheries last year 287 were engaged in trawling, will he state how this latter figure compares with the number of steam trawlers employed during each of the five preceding years.

MR. SINCLAIR: The figures are as follows—

1902 - - - - -	275
1903 - - - - -	280
1904 - - - - -	270
1905 - - - - -	266
1906 - - - - -	274

Illegal Trawling—Gratuities for Fishermen.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland in view of the fact that last year local fishermen materially assisted the Fishery Board for Scotland in securing the prosecution of persons engaged in illegal trawling, by detecting no less than twenty-six vessels thus occupied, will he consider the expediency of arranging for the award of gratuities to fishermen for services of this character.

MR. SINCLAIR: The suggestion advanced by my hon. friend has been considered, but in my opinion it is inexpedient as a matter of public policy.

Prosecutions for Illegal Trawling—New Police Cruiser.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that the number of prosecutions for illegal trawling increased last year to 131, as compared with thirty-eight, the highest previous record; and, seeing that this points to a large increase in the number of persons who occupy themselves in destroying the means of livelihood of the line fisher men, will he state when the new sea police cruiser which was promised some time since is likely to be placed at the disposal of the Fishery Board for Scotland.

MR. SINCLAIR: I must refer my hon. friend to the reply given yesterday to the hon. Member for St. Andrews Burghs.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Can the right hon. Gentleman state the dimensions of the new vessel?

MR. SINCLAIR: I have not that information.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: The right hon. Gentleman has had time to get it by post.

Legislation for the Suppression of Illegal Trawling.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that the recently issued Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland shows that last year there were 131 prosecutions for illegal trawling as compared with thirty-eight, the highest previous record, will he either introduce more drastic legislation for the suppression of illegal trawling or support the Bills which have been introduced by private Members for that purpose.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The number of prosecutions in 1907 was quite abnormal, owing to the number of cases reported to the authorities, as a consequence of the decision of the High Court of Justiciary bearing on the Moray Firth bye-law. In view of the negotiations which are proceeding the Secretary for Scotland does not consider the present an opportune time for legislation.

Illegal Trawling by Foreigners.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that, out of 131 prosecutions for illegal trawling ast year, no less than 100 were against the masters of foreign trawlers, ninety-six of whom were detected operating in the waters of the Moray Firth; and seeing that these foreigners have shown an indifference to the penalities inflicted, two masters having repeated the offence on eleven different occasions, one on eight occasions, three on six occasions, and two on four occasions, will he suggest to the Foreign Secretary the desirability of negotiating with the Powers under whose flag these vessels sail some arrangement under which persons of this character may have their certificates temporarily suspended.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There are objections to addition of penalities beyond those imposed by statute, and I do not see my way to approaching my right hon. friend on the lines suggested.

Tuberculosis Prevention in Scotland.

Mr. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware of the improved attitude of public opinion in Ireland on the subject of prevention of tuberculosis, due to the work of Lady Aberdeen; whether he is aware that public opinion in Scotland is maturing in favour of legislation; and whether he will introduce for Scotland a measure on the lines of the Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am aware of the fact as stated, and will keep the matter in view, but I may refer my hon. friend to the Local Government Board's Circular of 10th March, 1906, and to the Public Health Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1907, from which it will be seen that every phase of pulmonary phthisis is already administratively provided for in Scotland by the existing public health legislation of that country. I may add that the Local Government Board are shortly to issue a second Memorandum indicating the progress that has been made in the administrative control of the disease during the last two years, and the Board have already consented to the adoption of the compulsory notification Act by nine local authorities.

Tooma Shooting Outrage.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a man named Patrick Lyons, of Tooma, County Leitrim, was recently shot; whether he can say if he is seriously injured, what arrests have been made, and what sentence passed; whether he is aware that cattle-drives recently took place in the district of Tuam, where the stock of a cattle owner, near Tullinadaly, consisting of 225 sheep and fourteen head of cattle were driven, and from a farm on the estate of Colonel Walter Nolan, where sixty-seven sheep and five cattle were driven; and what arrests have been made and what sentences passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): The police authorities inform me that on 7th June, in County Leitrim, Patrick Lyons was fired at and seriously injured in the thigh, but is now progressing favourably. The accused person has been arrested, and the proceedings are pending. The cattle-drives referred to in the second part of the Question recently took place in the County Galway. No arrests have been made in those cases.

to the appointment of a permanent inspectorate in conformity with the recommendations of the Report of the Commission in 1899 and with the provisions of the Act of 1900, is founded upon financial considerations or upon other grounds; and whether, in view of the anxiety in Ireland as to the future of intermediate examination, the Government will consent to the publication of the correspondence between the Intermediate Education Board and the Irish Government on this subject.

Mr. BIRRELL: I have already informed the hon. Member that this entire matter is engaging my attention, and that I hope the appointment of inspectors can shortly be arranged. In these circumstances, I do not think that any advantage could be gained by entering further into the reasons why a permanent inspectorate has not yet been appointed, or by publishing the correspondence referred to.

Mr. FLYNN: Then the correspondence is not to be published?

Mr. BIRRELL: I do not think it desirable.

Mr. FLYNN: Was the delay in the appointment of this permanent inspector due to the action of the Treasury?

Mr. BIRRELL: No, not on this occasion.

Athenry Shooting Outrage.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the night of 14th June, about 10.30, when a man named John Burke, of Rockfield, near Athenry, was entering his residence, several shots were fired at him, one of which hit him in the face, inflicting very serious injuries, and that being unable to get in by the front he turned to get in by the back door, when a second volley was fired at him; whether he is aware that the cause of the dispute which led to such serious consequences was Burke's purchase of a small plot of land on the Lambert Minors estate; what arrests have been made and sentences passed on the perpetrators of the outrages.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed that two gunshots were fired at John Burke on the occasion in question. He was not hit by the first shot, but at the second shot he was struck in the head and the upper part of his body by about thirty pellets of shot. The injuries were serious, but his life is not in danger. It is the fact that Burke had been allotted a farm on the estate of Lambert Minors, but whether this fact afforded a motive for the offence can only be a matter for conjecture. The police have so far been unable to discover the offenders.

McCartie Estate, Headfort, County Kerry.

Mr. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why the sale of the McCartie estate at Headfort, County Kerry, is not yet concluded after three years having elapsed since the purchase agreements were signed; whether the action of Judge Ross in refusing the terms of the Estates Commissioners as to the sale of untenanted land on the estate is the principal cause of the delay; and whether, having regard to the number of uneconomic holdings on the estate, he can take any steps to carry out the intentions of Parliament by having the untenanted land on the estate made available.

Mr. BIRRELL: The McCartie estate is for sale in the Land Judge's Court, and I am informed that the assumption that there is untenanted land on the estate is incorrect. The Estates Commissioners made an offer to the Land Judge for the purchase of the estate, a condition of the offer being that a certain holding should be sold to them as untenanted land. The Land Judge could not lawfully accept this condition, as the holding was in the possession of a tenant. The Estates Commissioners have since reconsidered the matter, and have now made an amended offer which will be considered by the Land Judge.

Appeals under the Labourers (Ireland) Act.

Mr. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there has not been any High Court judicial decision as to the construction of the word "interested" in Section 6, subsection 2, of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1906, the governing word as to right of appeal from a Local Government Board inspector's order; whether he will consider the advisability of the provision of machinery by the Local Government Board and County Court Rules for bringing an appeal by an applicant rejected by the inspector as being interested; whether, seeing that these respective rules made no such provision, he will have them amended in the desired manner: and whether, in view of the urgency of pending cases, he will expedite the making of the Amendment in question.

Mr. BIRRELL: No judicial decision has been given as to the interpretation of the term "person interested" in the subsection quoted in the Question. The generally accepted and indeed obvious interpretation of the term, namely, as meaning a person interested in the lands specified in the Order, has not been questioned in a Court of law. I understand that a proposal to give the labourer a right to appeal against the rejection of his representation for a cottage was fully considered when the Bill was passing through Parliament, and was rejected. The Government are not prepared to introduce the suggested Amendment, for which no necessity has been shown. Its adoption would involve great expense, and would seriously delay if not completely block operations under the Act.

Knockanes (Kerry) Evicted Farm.

Mr. J. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the landlord did actually agree to leave the question as to whether there should be a sale of the evicted farm of Denis Healy, of Knockanes, county Kerry, to the planter in possession of the same to the decision of the Estates Commissioners; whether the Commissioners, in opposition to the wish of the landlord and of all others concerned, insisted upon carrying out the sale to the planter; whether the result of their action is that a police hut and four policemen have to be maintained on the farm at the public expense; whether the Commissioners are aware that Denis Healy has been committed to the lunatic asylum since their decision, and his wife left in a miserable hut near the farm in a condition of extreme poverty; and how or when they propose to afford any relief to Mrs. Healy.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the owner was willing that they should adopt any course they deemed proper in this case. As the hon. Member has already been informed, they sanctioned an advance for the purchase of the holding to Timothy Kennedy, who was not a planter, but possessed a legal interest in the holding which had been acquired by purchase. Kennedy receives police protection, but the police hut at Knockanes does not exist solely for that purpose. The neighbouring district is policed from the station. It is the case that Denis Healy has been committed to a lunatic asylum, but I am informed that his committal was due to quite other causes than those connected with the evicted farm. The Estates Commissioners have no means of affording relief to Mrs. Healy.

Mr. J. MURPHY asked whether, in view of the difficulties from which Mrs. Healy was now suffering, something could not be done for her.

Mr. BIRRELL: Unless the Commissioners can buy land, they can do nothing.

Evictions in Ireland.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that during the quarter ended 31st March, 1908, twenty tenants were actually evicted, and 290 tenants deprived of all legal interest in their holdings, under Section 7 of the Land Law (Ireland) Act of 1887, including 110 tenants in the province of Ulster; and whether, in view of the general adoption of a system of land purchase in Ireland and the large number of tenants who are annually deprived of all legal property in the holdings they cultivate, the Irish Government will take steps to repeal this section in the promised amended land legislation.

Mr. BIRRELL: The figures quoted in the Question are correctly taken from the Returns presented to Parliament. It is, however, incorrect to say that the 290 tenants who were served with notices under the section quoted have been deprived of all legal interest in their holdings, seeing that the section provides a right of redemption which may be exercised within a period of six months, and upon such exercise all rights are restored to the tenant. The Government do not propose to repeal the section referred to for the reasons of which I fully informed the hon. Member in reply to his similar Question of 6th March, 1907.

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that by the exercise of this Section 7—commonly called the "Eviction-made-easy" Clause—thousands of tenants have lost all legal right to their holdings?

MR. BIRRELL: My information is that only about 5 per cent. of the persons who receive notice actually go, the great majority exercising the right of redemption within the six months' grace.

MR. FLYNN: But is the right hon. Gentleman aware that even in cases where there is no physical eviction the tenants lose their legal status?

MR. BIRRELL: If they are not physically evicted they have six months' grace and in the vast majority of cases they do redeem their holdings in that time. Of course, they suffer to a certain extent.

Irish Excursion Train Incident.

MR. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the stoppage of an excursion train in the Goraghwood Tunnel near Newry, on the 18th instant, and to the panic caused thereby amongst the passengers; and whether he has received any report on the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: I have received a police report upon the incident in question, which occurred on Saturday, the 20th instant. It appears that a heavily-laden excursion train came to a standstill in Goraghwood Tunnel, the engine not being sufficiently powerful to pull the train up the incline. The train was then backed to Goraghwood Station. Some excitement was caused amongst the passengers, but no person was injured.

Belfast Hibernians Excursion.

MR. DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the attack made on the special train conveying the Belfast Hibernians from Newry, at Donegall Road, Belfast, on Sunday night last; whether he is aware that the Hibernians were subjected to a fierce fusillade of stones and many of them had narrow escapes from injury, and that the line for some distance was under police protection, but the bridge at Donegall Road was left unprotected; whether any arrests have been made; and what steps, if any, have been taken to bring the guilty persons to justice.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed by the police authorities that no attack whatever was made upon the excursion train from Newry on last Sunday, but that in the neighbourhood of the bridge at Donegall Road on that day a stone was thrown at another excursion train which was returning from Buncrana. A window of a carriage was broken by the stone. The person who threw the stone was not seen. The police were on duty upon the bridge and at other points along the line, in the neighbourhood of Belfast, but saw no attack made upon the train.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: What were the Belfast Hibernians doing that day?

MR. BIRRELL: Their duty, I hope.

MR. DEVLIN: If the police were not on duty on the spot how do they know a stone was thrown?

MR. BIRRELL: They saw the broken window.

Rathruddy Outrage.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any information respecting an outrage with firearms at the dwelling-house of a farmer living near Rathruddy, on Saturday, 13th June; and whether any arrests were made in connection with the occurrence.

MR. BIRRELL: The police inform me that on the night of the 12th instant, shots were fired into the house of Michael Glynn at the place named in the Question. The police have not succeeded in discovering the offenders, and consequently no arrests have been possible.

Ennis Cattle Outrage Claim.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the County Court at Ennis, on 16th June, damages were awarded for the cutting off of the tails of a number of cattle; and whether in any of these cases the persons who committed the outrage were discovered and prosecuted.

MR. BIRRELL: On 12th June, at the County Court at Ennis, compensation, amounting in all to £23, was awarded to four persons for malicious injury to their cattle by cutting off portions of the animals' tails. In three of the cases the cattle were on the same farm, and the injury was committed at the same time. The offenders were not discovered in either of the cases.

MR. LONSDALE: Did not Judge Bodkin say that a more cowardly and disgraceful outrage never came before him?

MR. BIRRELL: I have no desire to quarrel with the learned Judge's language.

Gowel (Leitrim) Cattle-drive.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it has been decided not to proceed further with the charges against eighteen men from the Gowel district, County Leitrim, of driving cattle off a grazing farm at Kiltoghert on Easter Monday; and, if so, whether he will state the reasons for this decision.

MR. BIRRELL: The men in question were summoned to give sureties to keep the peace. The case was heard at Carrick-on-Shannon Petty Sessions, on 28th May, when the magistrates were equally divided in opinion and the case was consequently adjourned. It has since been decided not to proceed further with the case, seeing that there has been no renewal of cattle-driving in the locality during the past two months.

MR. LONSDALE: Does the right hon. Gentleman hope to put down cattle driving by the display of such leniency?

MR. BIRRELL: I am of a hopeful disposition.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: How long are you going to be hopeful?

Armagh Boycotting Case.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether his attention has been called to the case of Matthew M'Dermott of Annagh, County Sligo, who has been boycotted for years because he refused to give up land which he purchased openly through the Land Commission seven years ago, and although he did not let it on the eleven months system; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that about four years ago Matthew M'Dermott purchased from the Court of Chancery a farm upon an estate in Sligo. He was partially boycotted for several years, but for the past twelve months has been free from boycotting, and no opposition was shown to him until his cattle were driven off his farm last month. The police will continue to afford all necessary protection to M'Dermott, as they have done hitherto.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): Is it not the fact that M'Dermott has been unanimously returned for trial by the local bench on a criminal charge?

MR. BIRRELL: I know nothing about that.

MR. O'DOWD: It is the fact.

Glensharrold Estate, Ardagh.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the Estates Commissioners are aware that the estate of Mr. O'Grady Delmege, situate at Glensharrold, Ardagh, in the County of Limerick, was one of the Campaign estates, and that there is a large number of uneconomic holdings on it which, if purchased by the tenants without their being enlarged, would afford them no means of a decent living, and consequently would be no security for the purchase money advanced, and, having regard to these facts, and to the fact that there is a large area of mountain in the landlord's occupation, part of which is let for turbary every year, whether they will not sanction any agreement for the sale of this estate, without having the small holdings made economic and the landlord's portion of the mountain fairly partitioned among the tenants; and whether, having regard to the peculiar circumstances of this estate, they will send down an inspector to make full inquiries into its position and try and arrange a sale on the lines suggested.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the estate in question is not one of the so-called plan of campaign estates which were reported on by the Evicted Tenants Commission of 1893, and that until proceedings for sale have been instituted before the Commissioners, and the case is reached in order of priority, they cannot see their way to send an inspector to visit the property. The Commissioners, however, will consider the several matters referred to in the Question if and when the estate comes before them to be dealt with.

Irish Mail Disputes.

Mr. MULDOON (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the Post Office, in a case of complaint by the Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland against the Postmaster-General in relation to the carriage of Irish mails, has refused to accept service in Ireland; whether this refusal is based upon the alleged ground that, under the 65th Rule of the Railway and Canal Commission, 1889, the Crown is domiciled in England; if so, whether the effect of this contention of the Post Office is that the Crown is not domiciled in that part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland; and, if this be the fact, at what precise date did the Crown cease to be so domiciled.

I beg also to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in all cases of Irish and Scottish railway and other companies having disputes as to the remuneration for carrying mails with the Post Office, the Department requires that such disputes shall be heard in England, upon the ground that the domicile of the Crown, under the 65th Rule of the Railway and Canal Commission, 1889, is in England; whether, seeing that this practice had a prejudicial effect upon the shareholders in such Irish and Scottish companies, as well as the public in those countries, he will say whether this practice is insisted upon in the interests and for the convenience of the permanent officials of the Post Office in London; and whether he will take any steps to prevent the inconvenience involved in carrying out this procedure.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The Attorney-General for Ireland has asked me to reply to the hon. Member's Question addressed to him as well as to that addressed to myself. The 65th Rule of the Railway and Canal Commission to which the hon. Member refers provides that proceedings before the Commissioners shall take place in England where the defendent has his principal place of business or head office in England. The principal place of business or head office of the Postmaster-General is unquestionably in England; and, consequently uner the Rules of the Commission claims by Irish and Scottish railway companies against the Postmaster-General for remuneration for the carriage of mails are heard in England. On this ground, the solicitor of the Post Office in Ireland was instructed to refer the claim of the Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland to the General Post Office in London. No question of domicile arises in connection with claims preferred before the Railway Commissioners against the Postmaster-General. I am not aware that any prejudicial effect has arisen from the operation of the Commissioners' rules.

Discharges of Telegraph Messengers in Ireland.

MR. J. DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the hardship involved in the case of telegraph messengers being discharged, on attaining the age of sixteen years, at Belfast and Derry; whether it is the case that at present in one or other of these offices some of the men are doing double work; and whether he will make inquiries with a view to finding other work for the boys so discharged.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Unfortunately, I cannot avoid the necessity of dispensing with the services of a number of telegraph messengers at the age of sixteen. Any overtime which is being worked at Belfast and Derry is of a temporary nature, and it is, in my opinion, undesirable to offer such work to messengers who have been dispensed with, as it would interfere with their opportunities of obtaining permanent situations outside the service. No suitable boys are discharged for whom there is a prospect of full-time adult employment being found within a reasonable time.

The Master of the Horse—Post Office Administration.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister under which statute the Postmaster-General has power to appoint a Minister assistant; and which statute empowers the Master of the Horse to sign official documents.

MR. ASQUITH: Lord Granard was asked to assist the Postmaster-General by the late Prime Minister, and was not appointed to do so by the Postmaster-General. With reference to the second Question, the Postmaster-General informs me that Lord Granard does not sign any official document which requires the signature of the Postmaster-General; and of course the Postmaster-General is responsible to Parliament for all that is done in his Department. There does not appear to be anything in the arrangements which have been adopted that requires statutory authority.

MR. CLAUDE HAY inquired whether the right hon. Gentleman was considering the question of the appointment of a Parliamentary Secretary to the Post Office in view of the large increase in the work of that Department.

MR. ASQUITH: I agree that that requires consideration, and it is under consideration in connection with the general question of the re-arrangement of Government offices.

Indian Reforms.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when His Majesty's Government purpose submitting to the House any measures of reform for India.

MR. ASQUITH: The consideration of measures of reform by the Government of India in consultation with the local Governments is drawing to a close, and the result is shortly to be submitted to the Secretary of State for India. His Majesty's Government will then decide upon the course best calculated to further the objects in view. It is impossible to fix a precise date.

*MR. REES: Arising out of this Answer, may I ask the Prime Minister whether such reforms will operate only in India, or whether they will deal with the encouragement afforded in the United Kingdom to agitation against our rule in India?

[No Answer was returned.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A. (in respect of the Access to Mountains Bill): Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Rose; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Idris and Mr. Lane-Fox.

Sir **William Brampton Gurdon** further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee A. the following Fourteen Members (in respect of the University of Durham Bill): Sir David Brynmor Jones, Mr. Hills, Mr. Talbot, Mr. Butcher, Mr. John Taylor, Mr. Mallet, Mr. Nuttall Sir John Tuke, Sir Henry Craik, Mr' George Marks, Mr. Scarisbrick, Mr' Silcock, Mr. Hemmerde, and Mr. Verney'

Sir **William Brampton Gurdon** further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee A. the following Fourteen Members (in respect of the Infant Life Protection (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Cooper, Mr. Walters, Mr. Simon, Mr. Chiozza Money, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Crossley, Mr. Shackleton, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Farrell, Mr. John Phillips, Major Ratcliff, Sir Benjamin Stone, and Mr. Du Cros.

Sir **William Brampton Gurdon** further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B. (in respect of the Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill): Mr. Joseph Walton and Sir Henry Kimber; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Staveley Hill, and Mr. Wedgwood.

Sir **William Brampton Gurdon** further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C. (in respect of the Prevention of Crime Bill): Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Kearley, and Sir Edward Strachey; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Secretary Gladstone, Mr. Herbert Samuel, and Mr. Attorney-General.

Sir **William Brampton Gurdon** further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee C. the following Fourteen Members (in respect of the Prevention of Crime Bill): Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland, Mr. Solicitor-General for Ireland, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Maclean, Mr. Robert Harcourt, Mr. Llewelyn Williams, Mr. John O'Connor, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Akers-Douglas, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Rawlinson, and Mr. Talbot.

Sir **William Brampton Gurdon** further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C. (in respect of the Telegraph Construction Bill): Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Kearley, Sir Edward Strachey, and Sir Francis Edwards; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Attorney-General, and Mr. Lyulph Stanley.

Sir **William Brampton Gurdon** further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee C. the following Fourteen Members (in respect of the Telegraph Construction Bill): Mr. Wardle, Mr. O'Malley, Mr. Patrick White, Mr. John Ward, Sir Henry Seymour King, Mr. Harold Cox, Mr. Agnew, Sir Edward Tennant, Mr. Armitage, Mr. Bethell, Major Dunne, Mr. Mackarness, Lord Balcarres, Mr. Courthope, and Mr. Staveley-Hill.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

COMPANIES BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 281.]

NEW BILL.

POLICE COUNTY AUTHORITIES BILL.

"To confer upon the Police authority in counties certain powers and responsibilities similar to those now vested in Watch Committees in boroughs," presented by Sir Charles Schwann; supported by Sir John Brunner, Mr. Brodie, Mr. King, Mr. Nuttall, and Mr. Schwann; to be read a second time upon Friday, 3rd July, and to be printed. [Bill 282.]

SUPPLY [13TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1908-9.

Class II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £11,600, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of His Majesty's Secretary for Scotland and Subordinate Office, Expenses under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, and Expenses under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, including a Grant in Aid of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Fund."

*MR. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs) said he wished to call the attention of the House to a matter of great importance, viz., the position and work of the office of Secretary for Scotland. Many Scottish Members had brought forward in that House complaints about the delay in the administrative work of the Secretary for Scotland, such as, for instance, the Edinburgh Water Trust Provisional Order, the question of the recent appointment of professors in Edinburgh and Glasgow Universities, where the chairs were vacant for nearly six months, the ever present and ever pressing trawling question, which still remained unsettled, and the question of the treatment of the unemployed in Glasgow. He did not wish to discuss the rights or the wrongs of those questions. His point was to show that there were those grievances, and to draw attention to what he believed to be the reason for them. He maintained that the Secretary for Scotland and his Department were overworked, and that there was put upon that Department far too much pressure. He would briefly remind the Committee of the history of the appointment of the Secretary for Scotland. After thirty years agitation the office was created by Act of Parliament in 1885, and the Secretary was given a salary of £2,000. His duties had been increased by subsequent Acts, and they were constantly growing. In 1894, by statute the right hon. Gentleman was appointed President of the Local Government Board for Scotland, and to-day he was responsible to the House for a large number of public Departments. There was the Scottish Education Department, the Prisons Commission, the Fishery Board, the Lunacy Commission, the Crofters Commission, the Congested Districts Board, and the National Galleries Board, and, moreover, he was entrusted with a great deal of patronage, much of which in England fell within the Department of either the Prime Minister or the Lord Chancellor. He had general charge of the work of the town and county councils, and he had a great deal of work in connection with Private Bills' Procedure and Provisional Orders. He had control of the constabulary in Scotland, he had the question of land valuation, and he had also to deal with river pollution, and to administer the Inebriates Acts. Under that head he would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman when they might expect to hear of the appointment of the Committee on the Inebriates Acts, promised some weeks ago. He had also general charge of the Universities of Scotland, and the House last year passed a Bill creating the Scottish Department of Agriculture, which would also be under the charge of the right hon. Gentleman. Another difficulty that the right hon. Gentleman was subjected to was that he had two addresses. Much of his work had to be done in London, but the administration was concerned with Scotland, and that involved extra work and a great deal of travelling. He did not think that that was an ideal system of managing Scottish business. He was afraid that if he said the only proper ultimate solution of administering those affairs was by a Parliament in Scotland, he would be ruled out of order, so he would refrain from dwelling on that subject; but as long as Scottish affairs were administered from London they should be administered properly. The work done by the Secretary for Scotland was done for England, not by one Member of the Government, but by several. There were the Home Secretary, the President of the Local Government Board, the President of the Board of Education, and the President of the Board of Agriculture, and most of those officers had two representatives in the House of Commons. There were the Home Secretary and the Under Home-Secretary.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member appears to be advocating a rearrangement of offices, and that is out of order. Alt that he can deal with here is the administration of the office of Secretary for Scotland.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said that the Secretary for Scotland was responsible, and if they could not criticise his administration on the present Vote what opportunity would they have to do so?

*The CHAIRMAN: The Local Government Board for Scotland and the Fishery Board cannot be discussed on this Vote, nor can the Universities Grant.

*Mr. GULLAND said he must content himself with saying that under the existing system it seemed to be impossible for the Secretary for Scotland to carry out the administrative work in the way it should be done. The administrative work of the right hon. Gentleman had to be carried on along with his legislative work, and in the pressing times in which they were living, when Bills rained upon that House, the right hon. Gentleman had so much of his time taken up in attending to his legislative duties that, having no Under-Secretary to leave at the office in his absence, the administrative work of Scotland did not get the attention it deserved. Then a great deal of his time was taken up by receiving and listening to deputations; that of itself was an enormous labour, and even his holidays were spent studying the land question or the fishing question, so that really his whole time was given to the administrative work of his Department. He was afraid he could not suggest an adjustment of the duties, and the appointment of an Under-Secretary, but he felt, when the Prime Minister told them earlier in the session that there was to be an inquiry into the readjustment of duties in other Departments, that this was an opportunity to bring that question under his notice.

*The CHAIRMAN: This is not in order.

*Mr. GULLAND said he was glad the Chairman had given him the opportunity of saying as much as he had. What was true about the Secretary for Scotland was true also about his staff; they also were overworked. The Scottish Members, when they went to the Scottish Office, received courteous and usually satisfactory treatment, but he imagined that that office was under-staffed, and he thought that the salaries, as compared with those of other offices, seemed low. When they went to the Scottish Office they were always referred to the Assistant Under-Secretary, a splendid official, and perhaps the most ubiquitous official now serving the Government, but all the affairs of Scotland had to come under his purview. He also was burdened with too much administrative work, and there was put on him, in a session like the present, an enormous amount of work in the drafting and re-drafting of Bills—not only Scottish Bills, but every possible Bill that in any kind of way applied to Scotland. Then there was the duty put upon the Secretary for Scotland of answering the Questions that Scottish Members raised. That day there were no fewer than fifteen Questions, and they gave the right hon. Gentleman a great deal of trouble to find out the facts and to put them so well before the House. He saw now that another part of his administrative work was the answering of unstarred Questions of English and Irish Members who appealed to him to enlighten them as to the more perfect Scottish system of carrying through numerous matters. They grumbled about the delay in the administrative work, and he believed there was reason for grumbling, but he did not think they had a charge against the right hon. Gentleman personally; it was because Parliament had put on him so much work that it was impossible for him to give——

*The CHAIRMAN: I must really ask the hon. Member to carry out my ruling.

*Mr. GULLAND remarked that he had said all he had to say, and he pointed out in conclusion that when that administrative work of the right hon. Gentleman was so great it was very difficult for the affairs of Scotland to get the treatment to which they were entitled.

Mr. PIRIE said he wished to criticise the administrative functions of the Secretary for Scotland and the administrative deficiencies of the office. Everyone would recognise that there was nothing personal in what he had to say. On the contrary, the objections he had to state were to the present system, and not to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland in dealing with the administrative duties he had to carry out. He wished to prove how since the appointment of the Secretary for Scotland the natural development of democratic government had brought about the present situation. and must inevitably bring about a further development of the grievances which were felt in relation to the treatment of Scotland. It appeared that immediately after the Union the office of Secretary for Scotland existed for about fifty years, after which it was abolished. In 1853 an agitation was begun for the restoration of the office which had been abolished about a hundred years before. The same arguments were used in the House of Commons then against the restoration of the office as were used now when the Scottish Members urged that they should get greater independence when dealing with exclusively Scottish affairs. They were told that to restore the office of Secretary for Scotland would be undermining the Union. Anything more fallacious he really could not conceive. In 1883 and 1884 Bills were introduced by Mr. Gladstone to restore the office of Secretary for Scotland, and at last in 1885 the office was restored. In 1887, still further powers were given to the office by the then Conservative Government, and in 1894 further duties were put on the over-worked official.

*The CHAIRMAN: That is exactly upon the same lines as I have already ruled to be out of order. The hon. Member must not proceed upon those lines.

Mr. PIRIE said he would try to deal with the actual matters which had come before the House in the form of Questions which the Secretary for Scotland himself had been obliged to answer from his place. The other day the Secretary for Scotland was asked as to the length of time occupied by the correspondence which had taken place between the Board of Agriculture and the Fishery Board in regard to the trawling question. The hon. Member skilfully avoided giving a direct answer to the Question. If hon. Members would refer to *Hansard* of 1897 and 1898 they would find that exactly the same Questions were put in regard to trawling in the Moray Firth as were being put at the present time.

*The CHAIRMAN: This comes under the Vote for the Fishery Board.

Mr. PIRIE said he was dealing with the Answers given by the Secretary for Scotland to Questions put in this House. If Scottish Members were not to be allowed——

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is entirely out of order. There is a separate Vote for fisheries, and matters connected with fisheries have to be discussed upon that Vote, and not upon this one.

Mr. MORTON (Sutherland), on the point of order, said that the question of trawling in the Moray Firth in so far as it related to the operations of foreign trawlers could surely be discussed on the Vote for the salary of the Secretary for Scotland. They were told that day by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that he was waiting apparently for the Secretary for Scotland to move and give some assistance.

*The CHAIRMAN: Whatever the Secretary for Scotland is responsible for in connection with fisheries comes upon the Fisheries Vote, which is the next Vote to this, and whatever the Foreign Secretary is responsible for comes upon the Foreign Secretary's Vote.

Mr. MORTON asked whether the action of the Secretary for Scotland in regard to fisheries could not be discussed on the Vote for his salary.

*The CHAIRMAN: No, it is always the case when you have a separate Vote and a separate subject to have the discussion upon that Vote. This Vote is for the office of the Secretary for Scotland, and any subject in regard to fisheries must be discussed on the Fisheries Vote. Matters relating to the work of the Secretary of State for

Foreign Affairs can only be discussed on the Foreign Office Vote.

MR. PIRIE said that that was most unfortunate. It was another example showing the difficulty Scottish Members had in calling attention to matters relating to the administration of Scottish affairs. They were driven from pillar to post. They only had about six hours for the discussion of these matters when the salary of the Secretary for Scotland was put down, and it was most unfair that they should not be allowed to discuss them. He must enter his emphatic protest against a method of procedure which rendered it impossible for——

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must not speak in that way.

MR. PIRIE: I maintain what I say.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is precisely because the hon. Member is not taking advantage of his opportunity that I have called him to order.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said it was not for the Scottish Members to advocate the cause of the Secretary for Scotland. His amount of work and his salary were his look-out. If he did not want the job he need not take it. The Scottish Members were entitled to have their work properly and efficiently done. He personally had every reason to complain of the way in which his questions with regard to the migration of cottars were answered. He wished once more to call attention to the condition of affairs in the island of Lewis. In Lewis cruel evictions had been carried out in the past, and, though in the last year the landlord had stayed his hand, at any moment there might be an outbreak of the troubles there with disastrous results. He insisted that serious attention should be given to the subject. Again and again they were told the matter was under consideration, and meantime congestion went on, and nothing was done. Deer forests increased, and men and women suffered and starved. It was not legislation but administration he asked for. Under the Act of 1897 the Secretary for Scotland had the machinery for migration, but he did not put that machinery in motion. It was repugnant to his feelings to make the charge of neglect; but the delay was inexcusable, and he had pledges in writing that a scheme would be ready early in June. Promises of land reform had been many before the general election; but nothing had been done but the bringing forward of an impossible Bill for vote-catching purposes. ["Hear, hear," and "Oh, oh!"] He had good reason for what he said. Another subject he desired to refer to was the state of matters in the island of Vatersay. There was arising the repetition of an old story, and the trouble grew out of the old idea of landlords that they should control their tenants body and soul. ["No."] Yes, he knew the Highlands and Hebrides well, and Lady Gordon Cathcart inherited the old traditions, and seemed to think she should decide upon the occupation her tenants should follow, that they should go fishing, and not cultivate their patches of land. This lady would, if she could, forcibly deport the cottar and squatter families as Colonel Gordon did in 1851. Most distressing stories had been told him of the action then taken, but thank God a landlord could not now exercise such power, and he heartily hoped that the Lord Advocate would adhere to his determination not to allow the forces of the Crown to be used for such dirty work. The land at Vatersay was under a lease which expired in 1907, and Lady Gordon Cathcart entered into an arrangement in August, 1906, to grant a fresh lease, utterly disregarding the wishes and requirements of the people. How could these poor cottars clear off from an island in the Atlantic like Barra? The Highlands were rapidly becoming a vast deer forest, and he regretted that the Secretary for Scotland did not rouse himself to the importance of keeping this fine race of people on the land. The right hon. Gentleman followed a *laissez faire* policy, and said it would all come right. It did not all come right. There had been a big row, and there would be a bigger row presently, and ten men were lying in Edinburgh gaol as a consequence of *laissez faire* policy. He was a lover of law and order, but there were times when men could not stand it any longer. This land was occupied by their forefathers, and they had a better right to it than Lady Gordon Cathcart. The land in dispute was scheduled by the Deer Forests Commission as suitable for crofts.

Both Governments had been equally bad, and grossly neglectful in this matter. Lady Gordon Cathcart appealed to the Government to enforce the Trespass Act of 1863, but the Government refused and referred her to the civil Courts. He was thankful to the Lord Advocate for not sending gunboats, but Lady Gordon Cathcart made a fierce attack on him because he did not make an apology and go down on his knees and beg her pardon. He had never heard of a Minister of the Crown written to in that high-handed fashion, and was glad that, while treating her with the utmost respect and courtesy, he refused to apologise for what he said in the House. He hoped that he would continue to pursue that firm attitude. Lady Gordon Cathcart asked the Government either to enforce the law or to buy the farms. He hoped that they would not allow dictation of that kind to come from any Highland landlord. He wished that they had twenty or thirty men from Scotland to stand shoulder to shoulder like the Labour Members. They had done much since they came into the House, and he said with all his heart. "God bless them," and hoped that they would go on. But the Scotsmen did not stand together. He had often noticed that if there was a chance of getting any money out of the British Exchequer, Nationalists, Tories, and Labour Members stood together to get as much as they could, but the Scottish Members failed to do so. In 1899 he moved an Amendment to the Queen's Speech asking for legislation for the cottars, crofters, and fishermen in the Highlands and islands of Scotland. The late Prime Minister and every right hon. Gentleman now on the Treasury Bench went into the lobby with him and 142 Members voted for the Amendment and 145 against. Six more votes on that occasion and the Tory Government would have been beaten. He thought he was entitled nine years afterwards to come and ask the Government to do something for these poor cottars, crofters, and fishermen. The Government had been asked to reduce the sentence on these men, but there was no reprieve for men who interfered with the land laws. He asked for something to be done for these unfortunate people, and unless something was done speedily for the Highlands he believed that many more men would be put into gaol and there would be more breaches of the law. He was most anxious there should be no breaches of the law, but the right hon. Gentleman must arouse himself and do something, What was the good of their majority if they did not use it? They had not used it so far as the Highlands were concerned. He sincerely hoped that something substantial would be done, and that a migration scheme would be evolved without loss of time. For that the right hon. Gentleman required no legislation.

MR. PIRIE, referring to an earlier ruling of the Chairman asked whether there had not frequently been on the salary of the Chief Secretary for Ireland discussions on all the subjects for which he was responsible; and, the Secretary for Scotland having declared that he was responsible for all these Boards, which were similar to those in Ireland, were they not entitled to discuss the action of the Scottish Boards? He trusted the Chairman would look into this question, because it was a great hardship on Members from Scotland that they should be deprived of the only opportunities they had for discussion.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is making a speech.

MR. PIRIE: I am asking a question.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Exactly the same rule applies to Ireland as to Scotland. When Members wish to discuss the Congested Districts Board in Ireland, that Vote is put down. When they wish to discuss the Department of Agriculture, that Vote is put down. Other things are discussed on the Vote for the salary of the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

MR. PIRIE: May I take it from you, Sir, that this matter will be looked into? It is a precedent which cannot be allowed to pass without very grave protest on the part of Scottish Members.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can raise his protest if he wishes. He can put down a Resolution to draw attention to my ruling. Undoubtedly the hon. Member has not studied the question. What I have stated is undoubtedly the rule of the Committee. For my own part, I need not tell the Committee that I should be only too happy if there were no such rules. It is a great trouble to me to have to carry them out, but, being here, I must carry them out. There is no question about that.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said he did not question the ruling of the Chairman; as far as he was concerned he would be the very last to dispute it. He had hoped before the general discussion was closed to bring under the notice of the Committee a question which directly affected the administrative powers and duties of the Secretary for Scotland, whose Department was very hard worked. Everyone on that side of the House, at all events, would be only too willing and glad to acknowledge the courtesy and kindness they invariably met with from the right hon. Gentleman in regard to matters on which they approached him. The question he desired to raise, if he was in order, was the very serious one which had arisen in Lewis in connection with what might be called the breakdown of local government there. The rates had risen in twenty years from 2s. or 3s. in the £ to 15s. or 16s. They were almost wholly paid by one individual, who unfortunately was in a position in which he found it impossible to raise the money with which to pay them, and the whole of the local government of the district was likely to break down. He wished to get from the right hon. Gentleman an assurance that he would look into the matter, and deal with it. He asked whether he would be in order in raising that question.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not quite know what is actually the question which the hon. Gentleman desires to raise, whether it has reference to law and order. I presume the hon. Gentleman is not going to advocate something which would require legislation.

MR. YOUNGER: No.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If it is a question of a local *impasse* which the Secretary for Scotland could do something to meet, then it can be raised by the hon. Member; but if the hon. Gentleman desires to refer to a subject which relates purely to local government, then it would arise on the Vote for the Local Government Board.

MR. YOUNGER said it was extremely difficult to explain precisely what he wanted, or what remedy to suggest. Some twelve years ago a similar difficulty arose, and the Secretary for Scotland at that time came forward with a grant out of some fund which he had at his disposal, and he kept the machine of local government going irrespective of legislation. He believed the right hon Gentleman knew of that case, and he did not know whether in the circumstances he would be in order in proceeding with the question.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Nothing can be done otherwise than through the agency of the Local Government Board. Under these circumstances I would suggest that whatever question is desired to be raised on the point by hon. Gentlemen opposite is proper for discussion on the Vote for the Local Government Board.

*THE CHAIRMAN: In these circumstances it is clearly a question for the Local Government Board Vote.

*MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said he had put a Motion on the Paper to reduce the Vote by £900, but it would be for the convenience of the Committee if he were to move instead the reduction of the entire Vote by the sum of £1,000. Reference had been made to the present situation in the island of Lewis by the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty, but he ventured to say that the facts had become a little distorted in the stream of the hon. Gentleman's eloquence. He would like to say one or two words as to the actual facts. The remote island of Barra probably contained 18,000 acres. In 1878 the present proprietress succeeded to the estate, and the estate was divided into 8,000 acres crofts, and 10,000 acres farms.

As time went on, the population of Barra increased at a continuous and steady rate, and a demand arose for more land for small holdings. In 1883 the proprietress gave about 4,500 acres of land to be divided into small holdings, and in 1901 a further demand arose, and the proprietor gave 3,000 acres. At the present moment the proprietress held practically no land in Barra which she had not cut up into small holdings. The adjacent island of Vatersay was smaller, and comprised 2,250 acres.

AN HON. MEMBER: 3,350.

*MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said the hon. Member was including Sandray, which was a separate island. The land was sold to the Congested Districts Board, and in August, 1906, the rest of the land was relet upon a new lease to the tenant who had had possession of it for many years, at a rent of £400. The soil of Vatersay, he understood, was a thin soil, and while eminently suitable for grazing was not so suitable for purposes of agriculture. There was said to be considerable difficulty about the water supply, and he understood the tenant was allowed to go across to Barra to get water to water his stock. There was no school, of course, and no church, and the Congested Districts Board had not power to supply any money voted to them for the purpose of building a school, and therefore a school would fall to be built out of the rates. The parish rates in Vatersay were 17s. 4d. in the £, and the county rate 22s. 6d. in the £ and the building of a school would be a matter of somewhat serious consideration. He said this because some question had arisen as to the suitability of the island for making small holdings. It had always been the view of the proprietress that the land was not suited for the making of small holdings. It was scheduled as a suitable area by the Deer Forest Commission, but he was informed it was very doubtful whether the island was ever actually visited by any members of the Commission or their representatives. Experts had reported upon the soil of sixty acres of the land, but their reports were entirely contradictory. One said the soil was of very good quality, and the other said it was very poor; therefore they were in some difficulty in judging of the precise nature of the facts. What surprised him was that when a practical test was suggested by the Secretary for Scotland, complaint being made of the soil of that portion of Vatersay at present in possession of the Congested Districts Board, the people appeared to have put objections in the way, and the test, he understood, had not been carried out. He did not know why objections were put in the way or why the test had not been carried out. So much as regarded the geographical part of the case. In 1906 one or two cattle were landed in Vatersay, and more were brought over, and eventually the Sheriff was sent by the Scottish Office. He reported that the proprietress ought to be asked not to take any action, because the people who brought the cattle over had promised to remove them. No action was taken, and the cattle were still there. In August, 1906, the new lease of which he had spoken was arranged, and in October, 1906, the first of the squatting began. These men had gone over there, had got timber and some kind of corrugated iron, and had erected a number of houses. He was told there was at present something like 150 people. The first time this extraordinary state of facts was brought to the notice of the House of Commons in debate was in 1907, when the Leader of the Opposition referred, on the Small Landholders Bill, to the state of affairs in Barra. The Lord Advocate, on being appealed to as to whether there was perfect peace in the crofting districts of Scotland generally, said that throughout the whole realm of his jurisdiction there was perfect peace except in one remote island, the island of Barra, where the proprietrix had been unfortunate in her relations with her tenantry. He said these poor tenants at Barra had gone over to the neighbouring island of Vatersay, interfering with no human soul, in order to plant a few potatoes, hoping they might come again in the spring and reap what they had sown, and when he had been asked to interfere and take steps to vindicate the law he had said this was not a proper case for interference, because it was a question of disputed civic possession. He would not comment on the agricultural miracle involved in the suggestion that these people were going to sail over in October and return in the spring to reap the potatoes which they had sown, but with regard to the rest of the statement it was inaccurate in almost every matter of fact contained in it. "The poor tenants of Barra"—the men were not tenants but cottars—"interfered with no human soul." The statement of the hon. Gentleman opposite in regard to the present position of affairs would show sufficiently how things stood in that matter. "Question of disputed civic possession"—these men had never claimed in a Court of law any shadow of a title to the land. Everybody admitted that the land belonged to the proprietrix, and the only question was as to the reason for their being there. For a maximum of inaccuracy in a minimum of words that was pre-eminently conspicuous. What was to be done in regard to the present state of affairs? More land was wanted, and it was said that Lady Cathcart put difficulties in the way of the acquiring of that land. In a sense, he could understand hon. Members taking that view, because Lady Cathcart had always thought Vatersay was not a place fitted by nature for experiments in small holdings. If they went further, and said that having accepted its suitability she had then put difficulties in the way, no suggestion could possibly be more remote from the truth. Lady Cathcart had offered, not once, but repeatedly, to sell the land to the Congested Districts Board. Why had they not accepted that offer? There was no question of price, because it had never got the length of the price being mooted. Lady Cathcart said she was perfectly willing to accept a fair and reasonable price, and to submit the question to arbitration, and to take whatever price might be adjudicated as fair and reasonable. He had noticed in Questions and in other ways in the last few weeks a sort of suggestion that Lady Cathcart had in her dealings with a Government Department stuck out for an exorbitant price. If hon. Members would look at the statement which had been circulated, they would see on page 36 a statement of Lady Cathcart's transactions with the Government. There were only two transactions in Barra and Vatersay. One was a sale of sixty acres in Vatersay, at a price which the Government's agent, who inspected the land, said was a fair price, and was practically the price which he had put upon the land himself. The other was a sale of land in Barra in regard to the price of part of which he understood no question was raised. The rest was sold for £5,500, and it was said that that was too much. It was said that the Crofters Commission proceeded, immediately the estates were acquired by the Government to reduce the rents. It was quite true., The price paid by the Government was £7,500 for the whole, and the rents were reduced to something like £5,500. The difference between the two represented, in the first place, compensation to the tenants who were forced to surrender their existing leases, and, in the second place, the value of the land for other than agricultural purposes. Lady Cathcart would have got the full price, and more than the full price, which she got from the Government, from the other competitor who was in the market at the same time. In the present case there was no question of price, but the right hon. Gentleman said it was out of harmony with the Government policy, and insisted on his own suggestion. The first thing that happened was that the Secretary for Scotland wrote a letter on 5th September, 1907, making proposals for the settlement of the island under the Congested Districts Board. Lady Cathcart thought that was not a wise proposal, but when pressed by the Government she reluctantly consented. The first thing was to make some arrangement in the existing situation. A new lease had come into operation, and had been arranged thirteen months before. Lady Cathcart was naturally anxious to see what was to be done for her tenants, because she had had previous experience of land taken by the Congested Districts Board, or rather land which had been scheduled by them. Lady Cathcart, in the case he alluded to, gave notice to her tenant, who quitted the land, and afterwards the Congested Districts Board were unable to carry out their scheme, and the land was thrown upon her hands, the result being that she had not been able to get a tenant for that land. It was almost incredible, but the Government had taken up the position that compensation to be given to the tenant for surrendering his lease was not a matter for the Government but a question to be settled between the proprietor and the tenant. In this House and in Committee over and over again they were assured that in legislative proposals the Government had taken steps by Amendments to secure that loss on the letting value to the landlord and the tenant, arising from the acquisition of a farm for small holdings, should be compensated. In the case which he had laid before the Committee the Secretary for Scotland afterwards wrote informing Lady Cathcart that the whole of her farm might not be required for new holdings. If there was in Barra this tremendous hunger for land, why not take those 2,000 acres? Probably he would be told they were not all suitable, but in that case what the Government really proposed was to pick out the heart of the farm for small holdings. In the present trouble with the squatters Lady Cathcart had been told that she had a civil remedy. He had heard her ladyship blamed because some hon. Members held the idea that she had hastened into Court in order to get these men put into prison, but nothing could be further from the truth. Lord Tweedmouth in the House of Lords said that the action of the Vatersay men could not be stigmatised too strongly, because it was monstrous and intolerable. His Lordship further stated that Lady Cathcart had been badly served by her agents, and if an interdict had been taken out and enforced the trespassers would have been driven off her land. Here was a case where a Member of the Liberal Government was not blaming the proprietrix for resorting to the law, but blaming the agents for delay in taking legal proceedings. He was aware that proceedings by civil process were cumbrous and expensive, but there was another process ready to the hand of the right hon. Gentleman and his advisers which they declined to use, but their reasons for declining appeared to him very insufficient. The process he alluded to was under the Trespass Acts of 1865. They had no law of trespass in Scotland, generally speaking, but squatting without the consent of the owner was an offence under the Act of 1865, which provided that—

> "Every person who lodges in any premises or occupies or encamps on any land being private property without the consent and permission of the owner or legal occupier commits an offence and may be prosecuted and punished."

That was the law in Scotland, and why was it not applied by the right hon. Gentleman? The first answer given was that the Act was inapplicable in this case because it was intended to refer only to single instances, and this was a case of continuous possession of land. A more extraordinary statement was never made on behalf of a Minister of the Crown. In order to escape the penalties of the law it appeared that all a man needed to do in future would be to persist in his wrong-doing. It was wrong to do this for one day, but if they went on occupying the land for a long time it could not be objected to. At any rate, that was the sum and substance of the position taken up by the Secretary for Scotland. The Lord Advocate, however, took a different view, and he said there was no precedent for interference in this case, and that it would be an act of great impropriety to apply any such legislation to the present state of affairs. In the year 1891, in the island of Orinsay, that Act was applied and no question was raised in the Court at the time as to its competency and though no law agent was present, there was a very clever agent representing the Land League present who was afterwards complimented by the Judge upon the ability with which he had stated his case. Fortunately occurrences of this character were very rare and this was the only precedent in regard to an affair of this magnitude. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman and the Law Officers of the Crown that this very Act was being invoked in the case of a much humbler class of offender. When a tinker was imprisoned for sleeping out the conviction took place under the Trespass Act of 1865. If humble offenders of that kind were brought up under that Act, why had it not been applied in this case? A man could be brought up and punished under the Act for sleeping out and yet they refused to apply the Act in the case of men who had taken forcible possession of land which did not belong to them. He called that robbery and there was no other name for it. He knew that in the House and out of it there was a great amount of sympathy with the case of these men, but he could not say how far that sympathy was founded upon a real knowledge of the facts. Those men undoubtedly had a very hard life and lived in poor houses, and experienced the greatest difficulty in making both ends meet. They had a hard life and were the victims of circumstances and of a system which the Government wanted to extend to the whole of Scotland. The houses were poor because they had divorced the landlords from interest in the upkeep of them. The holdings did not pay because they were uneconomic. He wished to call attention to the fact that the statement in the note at the bottom of page 4 of the Correspondence was most misleading. The document referred to was never pretended to be a judicial statement of the situation as it existed. The sheriff had written a letter, which was in posession of the Scottish Office, stating that the document was an *ex-parte* statement of the case, and that he did not make an inquiry which in any sense of the term was judicial. He simply went down to the place, took the men's statements, and reported them. The note might lead one naturally to a different conclusion. There were one or two statements in regard to matters of fact to which it might be worth while to call attention, because they were absolutely denied by Lady Cathcart and her agents. It was stated in the report, for instance, that no house sites were available at Castlebay. He was informed that house sites were available, and that a number of fishermen were paying a moderate feu duty. [An HON. MEMBER: "How many?"] He could not say, but he was told the number was considerable. Did the hon. Gentleman deny it? [An HON. MEMBER: "Yes."] He could only give the information which was given to him. It was a question of fact, and the hon. Member might have different information from his own. There was a reference to a letter which had been written forbidding a man to build a house. That must have struck hon. Members as being a very serious matter and a singularly hard case. On looking into the matter he found that the place where that man was forbidden to build a house was a common grazing, which in 1883 was subdivided between thirty or forty tenants, and there was a written agreement that for the common interest none of the tenants should put up houses upon it. The case of the man to whom the Sheriff specially referred seemed hard, but when looked into what were the facts? In 1891 that man entered into a lease of a grazing, and, after he had been there ten years, he left, and was then nine and a half years in arrear with his rent. It was a judicial rent which had been fixed by the Crofters Commission. The last suggestion in the report was that Lady Cathcart had not appreciated her duty as landlady. Nothing could be further from the fact. He had told the Committee what was done. He had heard it suggested that Lady Cathcart had made a profit out of all she had done. If that were true, was it to be a crime for a landlady to make a profit out of what she did for the benefit of the community? Was it the Liberal idea that they were always to benefit the community at the expense of the landowner. So far from benefiting by what she had done, in regard to land Lady Cathcart had been at considerable pecuniary loss. There was one case which was so striking that he would state it to the Committee. It was the case of a common grazing which was let as a club farm in thirty-five shares. The rent to each member was £3 16s., giving a total of about £130. That was the amount Lady Cathcart was offered for the farm by a man of ample means and capital. The Crofters Commission in 1891 reduced the rents and cancelled the bulk of the arrears. The rents then due were £904 8s. and the arrears were £772 1s. At the present moment the rents were still in arrear by many hundreds of pounds. If Lady Cathcart had not subdivided that holding she would have got a rent of something like £130. As a matter of fact, she had only received rents amounting to £15 11s. He said that in answer to the suggestion that Lady Cathcart in subdividing the land in Barra had been solely consulting her own interest and disregarding the interest of those residing on the island. Much had been made of the sheriff's description of the squatters as fair and reasonable men; but the words which followed were not quoted—"except in their desire to get land, and take it if need be." The Government sent the sheriff to the islands to try to induce these men to desist from their course of action. The sheriff said to them, "Please go away, you are breaking the law." They said, "No." Then the Government turned to Lady Cathcart and said, "You must arrange for these men to stay, and you must do it at your own expense." He blamed the Government for not having adopted the advice of the sheriff to buy the land, which could be had from Lady Cathcart at a reasonable price. He blamed them for refusing compensation to the tenant. He blamed them also for not having maintained law and order, and for having tried to evade responsibility for the consequences. There were only two solutions of the difficulty. One was a scheme of emigration beyond the seas. Lady Cathcart sent some emigrants from South Uist and Benbecula to Canada some years ago. The latest account of them was that they were comfortable and independent on farms of the average extent of one hundred and fifty acres, and that they retained the most grateful memories of Lady Cathcart. The only other possible solution was the establishment of some more complete system of industries in the islands. That was the remedy suggested by the Congested Districts Board in this year's Report. But the Government shut their eyes to both of these solutions. They supposed that peace and happiness were to be secured by the extension of the system of dividing and sub-dividing the land among the crofters, which had produced so far but indigence and unquiet. He blamed the Government for the course they had elected to take. He blamed them far more for pursuing that course with a lack of consistency and courage, as well as with a total disregard of every principle of justice. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £10,600, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.*)

*Mr. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.) hoped he might congratulate the hon. Member for North-West Lanark on having dealt with what was necessarily a very difficult case with considerable ability and much moderation, and—if he might say so—his speech was able because it was moderate to a very large extent. He had no doubt the hon. Gentleman felt very keenly on this case—as he did from the other side, and as many hon. Members beside him felt. He hoped he might be able to emulate the hon. Gentleman's moderation in anything he had to say. There were really two questions involved. There was, first of all, the dispute between Lady Gordon Cathcart and the Secretary for Scotland and the Lord Advocate. The hon. Gentleman opposite had dealt with that at considerable length, and he thought he had better leave these right hon. Gentlemen to defend themselves. But there was another question which had been raised by the hon. Gentleman. That was the very long and very distressing dispute between Lady Gordon Cathcart and her tenants. Hon. Members could not understand the dispute with the Secretary for Scotland and the Lord Advocate without first of all mastering the other dispute and the full facts in connection with it. He had taken some trouble to acquaint himself with the facts, and if the House would be good enough to bear with him he would try to explain them. He once held a view not unlike that of the hon. Gentleman and of others whom he had heard speak or whose words he had read—that Lady Gordon Cathcart was a much ill-used lady. He thought the Leader of the Opposition in Glasgow put the case in this way. Here were a lot of unprincipled men deliberately seizing the property, without any legal right or moral justification, of a singularly benevolent lady who all her days had been helping them. The right hon. Gentleman said that on 17th January last in Glasgow. What he regretted was that the right hon. Gentleman should have chosen that particular time for making that statement. At that time these ten men were not in prison. Their case was *sub judice*, they were under the order of the Court to appear before the Court; and he regretted to say that the effect of the right hon. Gentleman's speech in Scotland was very serious for these men. The public at once took the view of the right hon. Gentleman, and the newspapers wrote—he must say with unwonted freedom—about these poor men, who could not afford to bring either the newspapers or the right hon. Gentleman into Court, while they were themselves imprisoned for contempt of Court. The *Scotsman*, writing on 29th January, on the case as presented by the right hon. Gentleman, said—

> "Her [Lady Gordon Cathcart's] fault has been habitual and perhaps unwise indulgence of the cottars, who are now repaying her generous and too considerate policy by forcible seizure and wanton injury."

That was to prejudge the case. Was it wanton injury without any moral justification? Had she all those years been too indulgent to those ten men and their fellows? He had examined the case very carefully and had reached the conclusion that that was not a true representation of the case. He did not blame the right hon. Gentleman, except in so far as he had been supplied with and circulated the wrong facts. What was the character of these men? Were they likely to be guilty of a wanton act of spoliation? They were of the West Highland fisher class. He did not put his case too highly, as was well known to Scotsmen in the House and to those who had visited the Hebrides, when he said that there was not a more law-abiding, peaceable, and loyal class in the King's dominions or anywhere else. Crime in the ordinary sense was entirely unknown among them. Any trouble that they had had was trouble arising from the land. That was the general character of the class, and the character of these particular ten men to whom the right hon. Gentleman referred was given by the sheriff of the county in his report to the Secretary for Scotland.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): What are the exact words?

*Mr. A. DEWAR said he had not the exact words of the report with him, but the right hon. Gentleman attacked the men as having made forcible seizure of property and as being guilty of wanton injury. The *Scotsman* interpreted that as the meaning of the right hon. Gentleman. The sheriff of the county was not in the least a land agitator. He was a strong Conservative, a most eminent lawyer, and one of the fairest-minded and most highly-respected men in Scotland. That gentleman went down and inquired on the spot. It was not a judicial inquiry. He went on the invitation of the Secretary for Scotland to see if he could clear up the situation. He tried to get at the facts and to discover where the real trouble lay and who was to blame. The sheriff's report was that the men were respectable, reasonable, intelligent, courteous, kindly, and thrifty. That was the class of persons against whom the case was that they had deliberately seized and wantonly injured property without any moral justification. He found corroboration of that report in the fact that every public man and every public body who had ever gone there took precisely the same view. And yet these decent, respectable, law-abiding men had broken the law. Why? If they had done wanton injury it must have been under very strong pressure. Was there a burden they had had to bear all this time in silence and alone? The Committee had not heard of that. The hon. Member for North-West Lanark had said that this was an extremely difficult case. He did not want to attack this lady, and would not do so. She was the owner of this property at Vatersay. He had not the least doubt of her kindness. But she lived far away from the islands she owned. She had not shown her face there for thirty years. These simple-minded people thought that if they only could see this lady their troubles would speedily end, and he agreed with them. But this lady had delegated the management of her estate to others—to a firm of solicitors. He did not approve of the management of estates by solicitors. Experience showed that absentee landlordism generally brought trouble. He had not the slightest doubt that these particular solicitors were quite a respectable firm; but he contended that the manner in which this estate had been managed during the past thirty years was such that, if his information was correct, it would throw a very different light on the action for these men than had been afforded by the speech of the hon. Member for North-west Lanark. Mr. Wilson, the sheriff, further said that there was great public sympathy in the islands with these people, because of the fact that Lady Gordon Cathcart had neglected her duty as a landowner, and long indifference to their necessities had gone far to drive them to exasperation. The sheriff did not use language of that kind or put it into the mouth of public opinion without anxious consideration. That language was significant it was a hint to hon. Members to be just. He found that in the year 1901, when the present Secretary for Scotland was not responsible, the Congested Districts Board Inspector, in his Report, said—

> "I found the people very reasonable and moderate in their talk and their demands."

What had produced the change? Barra was fifty miles and more away from the mainland. It was isolated from markets. When one went there the first thing that struck him was the houses like large beehives, mere temporary erections studded anywhere. Some of the townships, closely packed, were situated on a bog often knee-deep in water. Some were down by the sea-shore below high-water mark. If one inquired why these people built on bogs when there were thousands of acres firm enough, the answer was that they could not get any other land—not a foot of it. The hon. Member for North-west Lanark said that there were sites to be had at Castlebay. The hon. Gentleman would not say that unless he were instructed and believed it to be true. But his information was to the contrary; that it was impossible to find a site at Castlebay. These men were not of the crofter class, but cottars; cottars were landless men; and that was the root of the agitation. He agreed that they had no legal right to be there. They were there on sufferance. They had built their huts on sufferance, and the ground officers could come and say: "Pull down that house," as they had often done. The cottars desired land; they prayed for land, not to steal it, but to buy it pay rent for it, but could not get it; and so they built on bogs, or on the shore below high-water mark. The result was that the houses were grossly unhealthy. Disease swept through them from time to time—typhoid, scarlet fever, and diphtheria. He had gone through the Reports of the sanitary inspectors and they said that "the houses were unhealthy, the ground air was moist and impure, and gave rise to disease." Could anyone wonder that when these epidemics broke out it was a very serious matter to these primitive people, who were far from doctors. Everyone of the ten men now in prison had had fever in his house. Seven of them had lost relatives by fever. They earnestly desired to escape, and to pay for their escape. Time after time for twenty-five years they had petitioned Lady Gordon Cathcart, and had received no reply to their petitions. They had parish councils created, and they had some powers to create small holdings. The parish councils petitioned Lady Gordon Cathcart, and received no reply. The county council of Invernesshire sent down a deputation to Vatersay and to Barra, and held an inquiry lasting over nine days, and they reported that land was available; that land was urgently required; that land would be highly beneficial; but the land was not to be obtained on reasonable terms. What were the terms demanded for what, after all, was the health and life of the people? Why was it that a parish council could not get land on reasonable terms? What objection was there to keeping these people, who were supported by the public bodies, on the land. If these men who had reported on the matter were right then the estates management were wrong. Did the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, on 17th January, know the conditions under which these people were living owing to the want of land? Did he know the efforts they had made for twenty-five years to get land by peaceable and legitimate agitation? Did he know that the public authorities had demanded land on their behalf? If he knew all this, as he knew it now, did he still think there was nothing in the way of moral justification for their refusing any longer to live in their unhealthy environment? Was there not a point beyond human endurance, and had not that point been reached? He admitted that the law should be obeyed, and must be obeyed, but did not something also depend on the quality of the law? Were there not some laws that every good citizen disregarded without any loss of self-respect? There was the case of passive resistance. [Laughter.] If hon. Gentlemen opposite did not approve of passive resistance there was the illustration of the speed-limit for motor cars. Would any hon. Gentleman opposite who owned a motor car, or who rode in one, get up and say he did not disregard that law every day?

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not.

*MR. A. DEWAR said he was very glad to see that some hon. Gentlemen on the back benches obeyed the law. He knew the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition could not say so, because it was common knowledge that the right hon. Gentleman had twice got into trouble for not observing the speed-limit. Therefore, if the law appeared to the people to be unreasonable they would never be got to obey it. Of that the speed-limit for motor-cars was really an illustration. If a law which interfered with pleasure could be disregarded without loss of character or self-respect were those who disregarded it to condemn others who disregarded a law which inflicted untold miseries and privations on them? Were they, in the language of the Leader of the Opposition, utterly "without moral justification?" They had obeyed this law all their lives. They tried to alter it by every constitutional means for twenty-five years. They were in the last extremity. The Small Landholders Bill brought relief in sight. They were full of hope as it passed through that House, but when it became apparent that it could not become an Act and alter the law they were in despair. They took the law into their own hands. They went to Vatersay. Vatersay was but a mile from this unhealthy bog. Some of these men were in prison now, and yet their fathers lived on crofts in Vatersay. In 1857 they were evicted and sent over to Barra. These men still considered they were morally entitled to go back to what they thought was their home. Hon. Members opposite would admit that there was the law of dual ownership in these parts, yet they were attacking the Lord-Advocate because he would not make these men criminals. Hon. Members had said the estate managers had been generous and considerate. In 1883 some land was divided up into crofts, but, after all, every landlord had some responsibility as well as privileges, and surely one of the responsibilities were to see to it that every man on the estate had a chance of living a healthy life. Land was divided up in 1883 and crofters put upon the estate. When the Crofters Commission came to the estate five years after they reduced the rents 35 per cent. It was not generous, after all, because the rent was too high. It might be good business, but it was not generosity. The land was sold to the Congested Districts Board for thirty-eight and a half years purchase. Twenty-five years purchase was the usual price. Again he said that might be good business, but it was not generosity. Six hundred acres at Vatersay let at 2s. an acre was sold for £600 which came to over 100 years purchase. Again good business, but not generosity. It was said that harbours had been erected, water had been brought, and hotels built—that was quite true, but his information was that all that had been done on sound business principles. [Cries of "Why not?"] There was no reason at all why not, except that hon. Members must not now plead generosity. The right hon. Gentleman referred to generous and considerate actions, but Lady Gordon Cathcart made 12½ per cent. by it. Water was brought three-quarters of a mile by gravitation from this lady's own lake. For that water, the fishermen were charged 10s. a season, and the lighters 15s., amounting to a revenue of over £200 a year. This was perhaps good estate management, but the right hon. Gentleman must not call it generosity. The case against the Lord Advocate was that he did not put the Act of 1865 into operation. That Act was known in Scotland as the "Tinkers" Act, and was to prevent loafers, tinkers and tramps from sleeping and smoking in out-houses and in haystacks. It had always been used for that purpose except once, when it was sanctioned for this purpose. The right hon. Gentleman was once Secretary for Scotland; had he not frequently known squatting in various parts of the islands, but he had never once suggested this Act being put into operation. In fact, on one occasion the right hon. Gentleman stated that this Act would not apply at all. A conservative Lord Advocate, McDonald, said—

> "If a man trespasses on the property of another he can only be turned out on the operation of a civil Court, and the owner of the property has to suffer any damage done that may occur during the time necessary for that operation, because we believe that this is a free country, and because we believe that everybody will submit to the jurisdiction of the Court. Without that we should have no basis for our liberty at all."

That was said by the Conservative Lord-Advocate of the day, who was now at the head of the criminal jurisprudence of Scotland. And not only that, but the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition agreed with him. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I confess I thought that the able and conclusive reply of the Lord-Advocate would have sufficed the House as our contribution to this somewhat too prolonged debate."

The right hon. Gentleman agreed that the basis of our liberty depended on each man turning trespassers off his own land, and that law was well settled in Scotland. This was a case where the mismanagement of an estate had brought serious trouble with the tenants. Was it to be said that the Secretary for Scotland should step in whenever that happened and pay any price demanded? Would the House believe that in the middle of the negotiations in this instance a new lease was entered into for nineteen years? ["No."] Yes; after these people had gone there, and all this trouble had begun, the lease was deliberately renewed for nineteen years, and it was demanded that the Secretary for Scotland should pay this man his price. But he congratulated the Secretary for Scotland and the Lord-Advocate, who had gone a long way, on their courage in having refused to be browbeaten, and in having refused to be dictated to by all the journals in Scotland in regard to this matter. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for Scotland had safeguarded the public funds and had withstood the tempest, and so had the Lord-Advocate, and they ought to tell them that they were proud of them to-day. The real question here was, he feared, far bigger than he would be permitted to deal with in this debate, and as had been said the real blame rested with the land laws, which in the fulness of time would have to be altered. These people believed that they had the right to cultivate a few acres of their own native land, if they were able and willing, and prepared to pay a fair price. Hon. Gentlemen opposite even had admitted that principle, yet they had ten respectable men in Scotland sent to prison because they desired to get back to the land—the policy which for years in that House they had been advocating. He had seen these men in prison and talked with them. The House would perhaps permit him to say that he had never seen a better type of men in his life. They were quiet, respectable and reasonable. They had a passionate love for their native land, and desired above all else to be allowed to cultivate a few acres of it. The land was available, urgently required, and would be highly beneficial, they were told by public authorities. Why should they not have it? Why send them to the slums? The Royal Naval Reserve was recruited from these parts. These men are able and willing to serve their country if they had a chance. The hon. Member had read passages from a pamphlet which endeavoured to blacken the character of these men. He saw that, on page 11, it said that one man had a croft for ten years. He asked the hon. Member how the writer knew that the man had a croft. The man to whom the reference was made—his name was Campbell—had not a croft. He would like to know why on one page of this book it should be said that this man had a croft, and then on the last page, page 20, it should be stated that he had share of a grazing. They were two very different things.

MR. YOUNGER: It may be a mistake.

*MR. A. DEWAR said it was not a mistake. The point was that he had heard the whole story, for he had seen the man in the presence of his fellows. He asked him what was the real explanation of his story. He said: "The factor offered me a share of grazing." "I went there, and there were seventeen other men with shares of the grazing. When I went there I was the eighteenth. The seventeen men said: 'What right have you to a share of the grazing?' I said that the factor had sent me, and that he had made me deposit a pound before he would accept me. They would not allow me to share. I went back to the factor and told him. The factor said nothing. He never gave me my grazing, and he has never returned me my pound." That was no doubt an *ex parte* statement, and he thought it right to tell the House frankly the source of his information in order that they might test it. But he would be very sorry to stand there and give information which he did not know to be accurate. He believed it to be accurate; it was given to him in the presence of the other men, and they agreed with it. This pamphlet was admittedly inaccurate, because it called this man a crofter in one place, and then in another it said that he had a share of grazing. He certainly never had a croft, and he believed that he never had a grazing. He paid £1 deposit for one, but never got it. He had now finished, and he left the Lord Advocate and the Secretary for Scotland to defend themselves. He had not touched upon the case at all. He had endeavoured to tell the House, so far as he knew them, the true facts of the case.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down had occupied some part of his speech with an attack on the merits of the management of Lady Gordon Cathcart's estate, and he had endeavoured to prove that the cottars and crofters who were breaking the law at that moment in Vatersay were substantially and in reality only exercising those primal rights of which no law had a right to deprive anybody. That was his contention he understood. In order to make out that contention the hon. and learned Gentleman had traversed a wide field. He had accused him of making a speech about a case which was *sub judice*, and accused Lady Gordon Cathcart's agent, in a pamphlet circulated that morning, of misleading and inaccurate observations, and he had given a good many trimmings and adornments to the general basis of his argument on which he proposed to say one word before coming to the crucial and central point of the hon. and learned Member's observations. His last point was that the pamphlet was extremely inaccurate, because it called a man a crofter who had only a share in a grazing farm. Did this man sleep out of doors?

Mr. A. DEWAR: There is no house on a joint grazing at all. A cottar has only a right to put his cattle on a certain spot along with seventeen other men who share the grazing. A croft is a very different thing, and that is why I say the statement in the pamphlet is inaccurate.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR begged the hon. and learned Gentleman's pardon. This man had, of course, a residence on the island, and had a share of the common grazing. They might, if they liked, draw a distinction between that and other forms of crofter holdings and other farms, to be more accurate; but to say that there was any misleading statement, or that the ordinary usages of language were violated by saying that this man, who resided in an inland parish with a share of a common grazing, was a cottar, or that such a statement was almost criminally and falsely inaccurate, was pressing a very narrow point much too far.

Mr. A. DEWAR: He did not get the grazing.

An HON. MEMBER: He did.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he would deal equally briefly with the hon. and learned Gentleman's attack on himself—an attack most courteously delivered, but he thought most unfounded. He had made a speech in January in Glasgow, in which he dealt with the case of Lady Gordon Cathcart. He had forgotten the precise language he used on that occasion. Like many other persons who had a great many speeches to make, nature had kindly provided him with a memory which enabled him to dismiss them. By the courtesy of the Secretary for Scotland he had been provided with a copy of the speech. He thought that, so far as it dealt with this question, it was an extremely good one. He had forgotten how good it was. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that in that speech he had made an attack on the character of these men who were forcibly occupying somebody else's land. He had said no more about these men than the hon. and learned Gentleman had said himself. He said that they had broken the law. The hon. and learned Gentleman said they had broken the law. He had made no vituperative attack upon them. Perhaps he did not know the Western Highlands so well as the rest of the Highlands, but he could entirely endorse what he took to be the hon. and learned Gentleman's view that these people were very law-abiding, and in a general way sober and agreeable persons to deal with. He did not say a word against them otherwise than that they had broken the law. If he was asked whom he blamed for breaking the law, he would not put the chief onus on them, but on their advisers. He would have said they were misled by agitators, and that learned Gentlemen, like the hon. and learned Gentlemen himself, had gone down and told them that that was breaking the law, but it was a perfectly innocent and moral way of breaking the law, and he would have said that such advice given to people like that was sure to be followed, and that the blame did not attach so much to the unhappy dupes as to—he did not like to say reckless agitators or unscrupulous advisers, but he most distinctly said that the theories which the hon. and learned Gentleman had advanced were absolutely inconsistent both with any administration of the law and with the prosperity and welfare of those for whom the law existed, not the rich, but the poor. The hon. Gentleman had proceeded to make what was more serious than any personal criticism of himself. He had made some comment on the whole management of the Gordon Cathcart estate, which seemed to him to be quite unfounded. He had said that the county council stated in 1897 that the land could and ought to be obtained. But since then the whole of the land on Barra that belonged to Lady Gordon Cathcart had been subdivided. There was not a single acre which had not been given, for good or for evil—and it was a very doubtful question which—into the hands of small tenants. The hon. Gentleman had said that Lady Gordon Cathcart must not claim generosity for that. He did not know that Lady Gordon Cathcart did claim generosity. She had lost money by it. She might have let the land to somebody who would have paid rent, but she had let it to small tenants who had not paid the rent, and if it was worth while to deal with the question of her gains or losses that was a subject which the House ought not to forget. Then the hon. Gentleman had said: "You talk of the excellent management of Lady Cathcart's estate. Go to Barra. Look at the houses which are built there." But those were largely the houses, not of the tenants, but of the squatters who ought not to be there under the law passed by the hon. Gentleman's friends—the Crofters Act—the squatters whom the Crofters Act forbade to be there for obvious reasons connected with the economic prosperity of the land. But they were there. Against the law they had built these wretched hovels. Against their own interests they were still squatting upon holdings no more than adequate, which their fathers were cultivating, and the landlord was powerless to resist this illegal action of the children of her tenants. Was she to be blamed because houses which she did not want to be built were put upon her land by persons forbidden to be there, not by a small technical Act passed in the interest of the owners of the soil, but by an Act which was always represented as a great social reform, passed deliberately in the interests of the crofters themselves, by the Party to which the hon. Gentleman belonged? Were they to understand that among the many functions which were to be thrust upon the landlords was that of building houses with proper drainage, water supply and accommodation for all the persons who ought not to be on their land, but who remained to the detriment, destruction, and bankruptcy of the whole community to which they belonged? The hon. Gentleman had said that she sold the land for thirty-five years purchase. But the number of years' purchase for which it was generous to sell land depended on how high the land was rented, and it appeared that one of the competitors for the land at thirty-five years purchase was the very tenant who had been occupying it. If anybody knew the value of the land which he wished to buy, it was the tenant who had been occupying it, and it was perfectly absurd to say there was anything excessive or exorbitant in the price which she obtained for the land. But that was not all. It appeared that the persons to whom she sold it, the Congested Districts Board, sent their independent valuer, and they wrote afterwards to her and said the price which she had put upon the land was not in excess of the price their valuer had put on it. Was it fair of the hon. and learned Gentleman who had the unusual advantage of being the counsel for these unfortunate and misguided men, to raise a cheap and easy cheer against a landlord who could not be there to defend herself, and who belonged to a class which it was very easy to attack and of which the defence was not always a very popular undertaking?

Mr. A. DEWAR said he did not think on reflection the right hon. Gentleman would accuse him of having come down to raise a cheap cheer. The right hon. Gentleman and his followers had repeated the statement that this was a singularly generous lady, and that she had shown her generosity in this matter. He replied to that by saying she got a very good price.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he could not accept the explanation of the hon. Member. Lady Gordon Cathcart's position, as he understood it, and he believed this was uncontradicted and uncontradictable, was that through all this she had used her property, not in the way which she thought most advisable for her own interest or for the interest of her tenants, but in accordance with the advice of the Congested Districts Board. She did not believe anything would be gained by dividing up the land; and she was right, as he thought. She did not believe the course pressed upon her by the Government was right, but she adopted it, and if they were going to discuss her money generosity, he would like very much to ask whether Lady Gordon Cathcart had or had not pecuniarily gained from this part of her property. Lady Cathcart would have been ruined had she depended upon what she got for her property in Barra, as an unfortunate landlord of Lewis had been unable to meet his financial position for precisely similar reasons. The last point of the hon. Gentleman was that all this trouble would have been saved if the Land Bill of the Government relating to Scotland had been passed into law. The Land Bill suggested by the Government, as they told them over and over again, was an extension of the Crofters Act from the Highlands to the Lowlands of Scotland. That was the blessing they were going to give to the Lowlands of Scotland. But the Act was in force in the Highlands. This very part of the Highlands was under the Act.

Sir J. DEWAR (Inverness): There is no power to give new holdings under the Crofters Act.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is entirely mistaken. They have been given under this very Act on this very estate.

Sir J. DEWAR: By agreement only.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that that was the hon. Gentleman's point. His idea, therefore, was that all this trouble had arisen because the Government had not compulsory powers to take the small island of Vatersay and divide it up. What were the facts about the small island of Vatersay? The facts were, in the first place, that, in the opinion at least of the owner of the island, it was not fit for crofting. In the second place she said: "Well, if you dissent from that, I will sell you the land." In the third place she said: "If that does not satisfy you, I will go against my judgment and allow it to be divided up among the crofters; only you must compensate the tenant." Did the hon. Gentleman say that under the Government Scottish Land Bill of last year the tenant would not have been compensated? He was very ready to interrupt a moment ago. He did not interrupt me now.

SIR J. DEWAR: I quite agree with him in this case.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said in that case the whole case broke down. The landlord was prepared to do precisely that which would have been done by compulsion under the Bill of the right hon. Gentleman had it been passed into law. And the man who stood in the way of that Bill being carried out, the man who prevented the island being subdivided, the man who prevented the compensation being given to the tenant, was the Secretary for Scotland. He thought he had dealt with all the more important aspects of the hon. Gentleman's speech, but, in his opinion, that speech did not touch the really important aspect of the question, and it was to that that he would most earnestly and respectfully ask the attention of the House. He was not going to enter into the controversy as to the particular action of the Government or the Lord Advocate—whether they ought to have intervened earlier or under a different law. He personally thought they had been much to blame for the course they had pursued, but he had really nothing to add to the really admirable presentation of the case by his hon. friend behind him. There was a deeper and, as he thought, an uncontroversial aspect of the question which he would most anxiously press upon all who were interested either in the land question generally or more particularly in the land question as it affected the Western Islands of Scotland. The hon. and learned Gentleman seemed to hold that what was wanted in that part of the world was the perpetual division and sub-division of these wretched holdings into fragments more and more uneconomic, or perhaps he had better say less and less economic. This was not a question of dividing into better farms and into a more desirable system rich land on which men could live and thrive and pay their rates and rent, and bring up their families. Those holdings started by being like the very worst holdings in the West of Ireland, and the terrific and appalling lesson of the Irish famine had not penetrated there. It had produced in Ireland, he believed, wonderful effects. He did not believe that the danger of sub-division in Ireland was now anything like what it was when he came into the House thirty years ago, still less what it was before the great Irish famine. The danger of sub-division was as great in the Western Islands as it ever was in the worst period of Irish history, and the results were more disastrous. It was only because the relatively small population concerned prevented our taking account of what was going on there that the full gravity of the situation was hid. Let them take the very island they were discussing. Let it be remembered that that island was not a rich grazing island; it was one of the far outworks of Scotland towards the Atlantic—a wet and misty, sunless clime, a poverty-stricken soil. This island, of the natural and inevitable barrenness of which only those who had visited these islands could form a conception, had the following history as regards population. In 1861 the population was 1,853; in 1871, 1,990; in 1881, 2,100; in 1891, 2,300; and in 1901, 2,500. In the forty years from 1861 to 1901 the population has increased by 37 per cent.—and this upon land where the holdings were as small as they ought to be, and where the increase of population was an increase, not of small holders who ought to be there, but of cottars who ought not to be there in their own interests and in the interests of society. The rates of this wretched parish were 22s. in the £. He believed the Government had had to take over the administration of the Poor Law, which meant paying part of the rates themselves. They had had to take over education, which meant paying for education themselves. This parish, living in the poverty which the hon. Gentleman seemed to think justified the action the people had taken, was so poor that practically it was living upon the general charity of the community, and living miserably. Lady Cathcart told them that this small island which had been invaded was unfit for crofters, that in dry seasons the water was inadequate—that was disputed, but it certainly had no schools. There was nothing which constituted a civilised community; all that would have to be built. Out of whose funds? Out of the funds of the clients of the hon. Gentleman opposite, or out of the funds of the general taxpayer? But Barra and the neighbouring island did not stand alone. Let them take the case of the Lewis. The Lewis were much larger islands. In the Lewis there were at this moment 3,000 crofters—that was to say, 3,000 legitimate tenants. And what was their average rent? Their average rent was £1 18s. 6d. In addition to the 3,000 crofters, and on the land of the 3,000 crofters, they had no less than 1,500 cottars, who lived in miserable houses run up by themselves. They only lived there against the laws. They lived there without paying rates, without paying rents—parasites on the community themselves, bringing forth families, which, he supposed, were again to subdivide still more this miserable district. The rates in Scotland were divided, as all Scotsmen knew, between landlord and tenant. The landlord was owed £20,000 arrears of rent. On these £20,000 arrears of rent he had had to pay rates; he had had to pay the other half of the rates. He felt himself unable to meet the financial situation. The whole life of the community had been brought to an end of its own resources, and Lewis, like Barra, was thrown upon charity, was unable to carry on the duties which were thrown upon every community in the country. It could neither educate itself nor look after its own sanitation, nor carry out any of the functions which they entrusted to local authorities. Was there the smallest sign that this tragic process was being brought to an end? It was the business of the Government, of course, to see that the law was fulfilled; it was the business of the Government to see that no subdivision took place. He did not wish to be severe upon them for not carrying out that function, because he imagined it to be a very difficult one. He really did not wish to judge them too harshly; but this was a plain duty, and it was a duty which they did not fulfil. Let him tell the hon. and learned Gentleman that the idea that they could make up for this growth of cottar population on the islands which were inhabited by such small illegal outlets as were produced by the raid, the moral defence of which he had so rashly undertaken, was surely profoundly mistaken. Let them grant that Lady Cathcart was wrong about the water supply of Vatersay. Let them imagine that the Government at last saw that if they believed in this system of small holdings they ought either to buy the land as they could under the Congested Districts Act, or take it and compensate the tenant, as they would if their own Bill had become law—granted. Let them suppose that those clients of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite got their holdings. Vatersay was going to be immediately a worse Barra, as Barra was a worse Lewis. The hon. Member did not even suggest how the school was to be built. He did not even suggest how the water supply was to be carried out. Those people could not do it; the landlord could not do it; was the Government going to do it? The hon. Gentleman, if he had persuaded any Member of the House that the evils of the Western Islands of Scotland were going to be dealt with, or even palliated and alleviated, by such transactions as had recently taken place—even if they were legal, even if though illegal they were moral—if he had done that he had done a great wrong to the social welfare of that part of the Highlands. He had too much regard and affection for the population of the Highlands—["Oh, oh," and a LABOUR MEMBER: Parasites.] There were persons in this House who thought that affection was never shown except by suggesting illegality. He took a different view, and he repeated and everybody who knew him knew that he spoke the truth—that he had the greatest affection and regard for this Highland population. There was no population in the world who so rapidly entwined themselves into one's affections as the inhabitants of those bleak and desolate districts. But it was really madness to suggest that their lot was to be improved by telling them that they were doing right when, in fact, they were doing wrong; and even less was their lot to be improved by not throwing the whole of their weight into stopping this hopeless subdivision of land—this accumulation of uneconomic holdings, this addition of cottar to crofter until universal bankruptcy spread over the land—that was the worst of all. He did not wish to attack hon. and right hon. Members. Personally, he thought they had grossly mismanaged the whole of this affair, and that they had behaved most cruelly to Lady Gordon Cathcart. But that was a small matter. They might be angels of light; Lady Gordon Cathcart might not deserve—though as far as he knew she thoroughly did deserve—the name of an enlightened landlord. Let them remember that this debate on the state of Barra did not touch merely the action of the Lord-Advocate or of a particular landlord; it touched the whole social condition of a particular portion of these islands, and he submitted that the doctrine preached from those benches, and the practice of this Government led, and could only lead, to the further difficulty, degradation, poverty, and bankruptcy of a population which, for its moral as well as for its intellectual character, assuredly deserved well of the House and of the country.

MR. SINCLAIR said nobody could say that the discussion of the Scottish questions which came under the Vote now before the Committee had not aroused interest in the House. They had listened to two speeches, both of which had interested the Committee deeply, though from different points of view. In the earlier part of the discussion several general points were raised by hon. Members, and he would ask to be allowed to reply regarding those matters at a later stage in order that the discussion might be concentrated at present on the topic which had been discussed by the three speakers who had preceded him. The general position of the case was presented with eloquence and earnestness by his hon. friend the Member for South Edinburgh in the admirable speech he had delivered. He would say nothing on that aspect of the question, but he would address himself to some of the criticisms which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. In the first place, considering that the right hon. Gentleman had publicly thrown his great influence in Scotland into this controversy, he had hoped that they would have some practical suggestion from him in dealing with the difficult question before them. He must congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on having succeeded in importing into the discussion some matter which was at an earlier stage of the debate ruled out of order by the Chairman or his deputy when he entered on the discussion of the Lewis rates. He would not follow the right hon. Gentleman into a general survey of the advantages and the disadvantages of the crofter legislation, because he conceived that at this stage the discussion of that matter would be out of order.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think I ought to explain that the right hon. Gentleman himself assured me that the reference to Lewis made by the hon. Member for the Ayr Burghs involved a point in regard to local government. In this case Lewis was used as an illustration by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City in connection with the question of land congestion, and, therefore, it was legitimate.

MR. SINCLAIR expressed the hope that the Chairman would not think he was questioning his discretion. He was congratulating the right hon. Gentleman on having found a legitimate opportunity for introducing into the debate a subject which hon. Members had raised and which was ruled to be out of order. He was not going to follow the right hon. Gentleman into that sphere. He asked the House to note, for it was worthy of note, the position which the right hon. Gentleman had taken upon the present occasion. The right hon. Gentleman never lost an opportunity of declaring himself opposed to the whole policy of the Crofters Act. In doing so, he did not give much practical help in solving questions such as those which the Committee had before them that day. The right hon. Gentleman knew, and the House knew as well, that the people of the Highlands of Scotland were convinced that the Crofters Act had been the charter of their liberty. It had been shown during the past eighteen months in Parliament that their sympathy had been with the Government in endeavouring to extend and amend the application of that Act. Now he came to the point under discussion, namely, whether the Government, as represented by the Lord-Advocate, the Solicitor-General, and himself, had in the exercise of their duties rightly administered the various statutes which bore upon this matter. He agreed with the hon. Member for South Edinburgh that debates which involved criticism of individuals were especially disagreeable in that House. He had no intention of criticising or making any personal allegations against the proprietress of this estate. He would venture to say one or two words on the peculiar position which this estate occupied in Scotland in controversies of this kind. It was very noteworthy that on this estate alone had there been recurring difficulties of this kind. From 1883 onwards this estate had been notorious for the occurrence of difficulties of this kind. It was obvious to anyone who read the Papers presented to Parliament that the tenants were completely out of sympathy with the proprietress, or rather with the estate management, because his hon. friend was perfectly right in reminding the House that they were profuse in expressions of personal respect towards the proprietress herself. It was true also of this estate, and it was true of no other estate in Scotland, that active intervention by the Government in these troubles had been necessary on three separate occasions during the period he had mentioned, and on two of these occasions the intervention was undertaken by the Government of the right hon. Gentleman himself. Large sums of public money had been involved, and, indeed, there was repeated proof that on no other estate in Scotland, he was glad to think, had the same kind of charges to be made. He would just enumerate them. The correspondence which had been laid before Parliament disclosed very clearly the endeavour of the estate management to throw the whole responsibility for these transactions and for the unsatisfactory condition of things on the Government. He asked the House to observe that these Papers made it clear, in the first place, that the estate management had been directed in accordance with a theory which was quite impracticable, and which had been condemned by all practical men who had been called to look into the matter. Repeatedly these tenants had been lectured and told to give up thinking of the land, and to do as the East coast fishermen did and restrict themselves entirely to fishing. Over and over again it had been pointed out that to compare the condition of the people who lived and worked in this island with the position of men living along the coast of the Moray Firth, who had access to shops, markets, productive farms and to the ordinary articles of consumption, was entirely incorrect. These men must have land for their children who were growing up, and if there were to be houses built and made available for them land was essential. It was the pressure of circumstances upon them, and not any desire to break the law—the needs of themselves and their families—which was at the bottom of the mischief. As a matter of fact, the estate recognised this in a limited degree in 1883 when land was broken up by the estate in order to meet those needs. Even then there were restrictions placed upon the concessions given which greatly reduced their value. His hon. friend had pointed out that when the rents came to be valued again by the Crofters Commission later on they were reduced all round by an average of 35 per cent. There were other restrictions which he need not enumerate placed upon the holdings, and subsequently removed. All through these negotiations, and all through the long letters which detailed the history of the position of the estate, there were repeated proofs of the strong opposition of the estate management to any further concessions of this kind being given. The estate management might, in its own opinion, be right or wrong, but he said it had been universally condemned, and condemned by nothing more than by its failure to meet the circumstances of the case. He asked the Committee to look at the last transaction. It was under the Conservative Government that a portion of land was bought in this Island for the purpose of being broken up. The price paid was £7,500, and that land was subsequently valued by the Crofters Commission at £5,512. The loss was borne by the taxpayers. As Mr. Speaker said the other day: "All Governments are fair game." That was the view of the people who sold land. [An Hon. Member: Not always.] He was not dealing with always, but with this particular instance.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Lady Cathcart, at the moment she sold the land, had as good an offer, if not a better offer, than that of the Government.

MR. SINCLAIR said that there were always two ways of looking at these transactions. The Government took one view, and he thought it was the right view, when under unpleasant necessity they were obliged by public needs to step in and buy an estate. He would quote from the pamphlet, which the right hon. Gentleman had already quoted, in order to show the spirit in which the estate management regarded the offer of the Conservative Government. It said, referring to Lady Cathcart—

> "She had two competitors for the property, both extremely anxious to purchase."

It was quite true in one sense that they were extremely anxious to purchase. The right hon. Gentleman said that that was a necessary step, and to describe his Government as going into the market and competing eagerly with some other competitor for the possession of land in Barra, was to attribute to the right hon. Gentleman and his Government a view which they never at that moment held. What he said was that there was a loss of about £2,000 on the transaction. What was the doctrine which the Opposition thought should apply to such cases? Did they say that the Government should always bear the responsibility when difficulties of this kind arose, a situation which they had no hand in creating? This difficulty was small compared with those which had to be met already on this estate. He said nothing on the question of the Trespass Act. His right hon. friend the Lord Advocate was far more able to inform the House as to the action taken by the Government on that matter; he would only deal with the question as disclosed in the Papers, and how they were to meet the present difficulty. In the first place the Government had made a most generous offer to the estate management. He did not think the Committee recognised how great the obligations and how large the expenditure were which the Government had undertaken in this matter; but when they faced the facts they were met with the same difficulties with which the right hon. Gentlemen opposite were confronted ten years ago. The same unreasonable claims were made; the same restrictions were sought to be imposed upon them; and the same difficulties as to how the Government were to deal with the new agreement made with the tenant. There was not a word of recognition in these Papers of the responsibility which the past and present Governments had had to bear in this matter. Therefore, he asked the Committee to be good enough to follow him briefly on the point he had mentioned. The Government had been blamed for refusing to pledge themselves to pay compensation to the tenant. The right hon. Gentleman had quoted the Bill of last year and the Bill of this year, as providing—which it did—for the payment of such compensation as must be determined, but he thought they had better deal with the present instance and not with another, an altogether different case.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): The Land Tenure Act of 1906 also imposed compensation being paid to a person leaving a farm.

MR. SINCLAIR said that that might be, but he was not dealing with that matter now; he was explaining the position of the Government in dealing with the Vatersay case. It was said that the question of compensation had been standing in the way of an agreement being come to in an amicable manner, which would have placed the land at the disposal of the settlers. That was an entire misapprehension. What were the circumstances? Some months ago, after parts of the land had been taken for the use of the settlers, and after cattle had actually been placed upon it, and a year after they had full knowledge that petitions had been presented, asking that the land should be made available for settlers, the tenants and the proprietor entered into an agreement for a new lease in August, 1906. If anyone complained that the tenant did not know what he was doing, that he had not measured the risks, that cattle belonging to the raiders, as they were called, were at that moment on his farm, then, if the tenant entered into that agreement without some *caveat* he was very neglectful of his own interest. The tenant and proprietor were fully cognisant of the risks and difficulties attending the conclusion of such an agreement, and he contended that the compensation to be paid under such circumstances should come to a mere bagatelle. What was the object in bringing in the Government in this matter? The Government received no information, although this was denied by the hon. Member for North West Lanark. It seemed to him incredible that while the proprietor was in correspondence with an advantageous offer for the land, when obviously the possibility of the land having to be made available for these settlers was known, no information was sent to the Government of the expiry of the lease, and of the fact of a new agreement being entered into for a lease binding the tenant and proprietor for a period of ten years, and possibly for nineteen years.

*MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said that the first suggestion to Lady Gordon Cathcart of a scheme was made on 5th September, 1907, but the lease was arranged for in August, 1906, and actually came into operation at Whitsuntide, 1907, six months before any suggestion came from the Government.

MR. SINCLAIR said he was very well aware of that; but the hon. Member knew from the correspondence that he had not gone beyond the truth in his statement. The cattle were on the land of the raiders and were returned to them; and the cattle were again put on the land by the raiders. He asked what possible claim could there be against the Government under these circumstances? Besides, in this matter he stood for the taxpayers, and he knew that the obvious effect of bringing in the Government would be to invite both the proprietor and the tenant to put their hands into the pockets of the taxpayers. More importance had been attached to this matter than need be, because it was argued in the correspondence that this small matter was really the obstacle to a settlement. If the Committee had followed the details of this matter they would know, as those who took part in the discussion of the Small Landholders Bill of this year and last year knew, that this question of compensation was a bagatelle compared with two other payments for which the Government had made themselves responsible. One was the loss on the letting value and the other the valuation of the sheep stock. The negotiations broke down because the estate management had deliberately and persistently declined throughout the whole controversy to accept any settlement which did not involve the handing over of the whole of the island to the Government by purchase. It had been repeatedly stated that Lady Gordon Cathcart had frequently made suggestions to the Government on this matter. He maintained that no suggestion to solve the difficulty had ever come spontaneously from the estate management at all. The suggestion came from himself in September, 1907, the difficulties having grown to such dimensions that it was impossible for him any longer to stand outside. Accordingly, he wrote to Lady Gordon Cathcart and urged that some settlement should be come to; and he put forward a proposal for making the land available to the settlers. Then came the refusal, and a counter-proposal which was equivalent to the purchase of the island by the Government.

MR. COCHRANE: No.

MR. SINCLAIR said that the hon. Gentleman would see from the correspondence that the estate agents, the estate management, and the proprietress concentrated their attention throughout on the endeavour to obtain compensation for removing the tenant. Why? Because once the tenant was gone, the island would have been thrown on the hands of the Government, not as owners, with power to do with it as they liked, but as placing them in the position, on the one hand, of being responsible to the proprietor for the rent of the land, and on the other of being unable, on account of the conditions and restrictions imposed on the tenancy, to act freely and settle the people upon the land. That would have been the position of the Government. What would have been the position of the owner? Having compensated the tenant at the cost of the Government, and having obtained a guarantee for the rent, she would still have retained the ownership and in some degree the control of the land. And all this within her legal rights! He declared that in essence that was an extreme assertion of the rights of property, and an extreme disregard of the duties and responsibilities of the possession of property. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition earlier in the debate had quoted the case of Barra as illustrating the whole position of the Western Islands. It was a singular fact that of all the islands Barra was the only one which showed an increase of population. No other part of the Long Island or the other islands showed an increase of population. Even in Lewis, which was a highly congested and thickly populated island, there had been no such increase of population in recent years, as there had been in Barra. What was the reason for that difference? It was difficult to say. It might be that the communications with it were few, that the community of Barra were more primitive and backward, and that the allurements and inducements to flock to the city and the influence of education, which was having some effect on the population of the other islands, had not had the same effect on this island. There was, however, another factor which should not be lost sight of. Barra had a valuable fishery in the neighbourhood; it had many curing stations, and there was a good deal of traffic there at certain seasons of the year. The proprietress as well as the people shared in the benefits of this state of things. This lady drew rents for the curing places and water rents, and therefore there was a direct connection between this considerable population and the rents and profits of the owner of the land. It was held reasonable to take the view that landowners in large cities had some responsibility for the dense population upon their land. Parliament had recognised the responsibility of landlords if they neglected sanitary conditions and had slum property. It would be just as reasonable to call upon the Government to relieve those landlords of slum property in the cities as to call upon them to relieve the landlord of property in islands such as that now under discussion. The Government must not be saddled with the whole responsibility. He believed that the offer of the Government had the approval of the Committee.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) asked what were the terms of the offer.

Mr. SINCLAIR said the transaction was perfectly simple. Acting for the Government, he had, in the first place, suggested to the proprietor that settlers should be placed on the land under the Crofters Act. She replied declining to do so, and offering to sell the land. The Government replied that they could not accept, and that their offer stood. The proprietress then offered a scheme of her own, which was not identical with that of the Government, which would put the crofter tenants on her land, and which was detailed in her letter of 12th October, in the Parliamentary papers. The Government then endeavoured to adjust terms with the estate management. The contention of the estate was that the negotiations broke down on the question of compensation to tenants, and he had been endeavouring to show that that was not the real explanation of the difficulty. The compensation to the tenants was a mere bagatelle. The real effort of the estate had been to throw the whole island into the hands of the Government, who knew nothing about its capacities except on general information. The Government were willing to aid the proprietress in any scheme for settling the crofter tenants that she might formulate, but were not prepared to have the island thrown at them. The Government took the position which the correspondence disclosed, and on that he asked the support of the House. The right hon. Gentleman had uttered a general denunciation of the Government policy; but the proprietress would be as much at a loss as the Government to know what solution he proposed. The Government were anxious to see a way out of this difficulty. The situation was serious from every point of view, and its gravity had been intensified by the proceedings which had taken place in the Court of Session only last week. In the interests of all concerned in this matter, in the interests of public order in Scotland, it was highly desirable that this controversy should be brought to an end. He hoped that would be brought home to all parties concerned by the debate, and that a way out of the difficulty would be found.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) contended that the Secretary for Scotland had in his speech absolutely avoided dealing with the kernel of the case, and had dealt only with details which did not touch even the fringe of the question. The hon. and learned Member for South Edinburgh had made an apology for these law-breakers for whom he had acted as counsel before the Court, and although he did not make a direct personal attack on Lady Gordon Cathcart by name, yet as she was responsible more or less for the management of the estate it was impossible to settle this question without attacking her. He had known for many years the result of the management of her estates, and from his own personal knowledge of Lady Gordon Cathcart he could say that no one could be more careful of the welfare of tenants or more generous where generosity was called for. When responsible for the administration of the education of Scotland every appeal he made to her was readily answered. He was certain, and he spoke with the ordinary knowledge of those acquainted with these Western Highlands, that in many respects Lady Gordon Cathcart was a model landlord. For an illustration of that he need not go beyond certain expressions used by the Scottish Secretary himself. Over and over again he appealed to her to step in and help him, and said that the popularity of her name and the high esteem in which she was held by her tenants would be of inestimable advantage to him in carrying out his scheme. What were the real facts with regard to this matter? These had been referred to by the hon. and learned Member. In the case which he referred to of the sale of a certain farm he fell into a considerable error; £15,000 was the price offered by the tenant of that farm, but he was induced to take a part for £9,500 and the rest was purchased by the Congested Districts Board for £5,500.

MR. SINCLAIR said the hon. Gentleman had made a mistake. What he said as to the price was correct, but one portion of land was purchased from Mr. McGillioray by the Congested Districts Board for £2,000, which brought up the whole price to £7500.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said the right hon. Gentleman was wrong in his correction. Mr. McGillioray made an offer, and £2,000 was paid for another part of the estate, and apart from that £5,500 was the sum paid. Besides, did the right hon. Gentleman mean to say that the advantage of making a bargain of that sort with a single, certain, solvent tenant, a man of capital, whose rent would always be paid, was to be lost, and that the estate was to be filled with small crofters or cottars, whose rents were small and for the most part in arrear? Did the right hon. Gentleman remember also what a burden was imposed upon the landlord? The right hon. Gentleman knew quite well that the expense of providing education fell upon the rates, which were paid almost entirely by the landlord and not by the crofters. The large education rate was not chargeable to any tenant whose holding was under the value of £4. If the value was below £4, the landlord was responsible for the rate, and might seek it from the crofter, if he could get it; as a matter of fact he never did. The hon. and learned Member had quoted another case in which he said there was thirty-eight years' purchase, but the hon. and learned Gentleman had only to look at the facts to see how totally baseless was his assertion. £600 was the price given for a farm of 60 acres, which, it seemed to him, was not an extravagant price where the annual rental was £50. That could hardly be called a purchase on "hard business principles," the phrase used by the hon. and learned Member, which he employed as a synonym for "ungenerous." What, he had to ask, and this was far more important, was the real object they had in view? What was for the good of the people, and whether the action of the right hon. Gentleman would promote that good or be detrimental to it. Everyone who had studied the position of these outlying islands knew that the great and central difficulty was the congestion of the population, which, as had been pointed out by his right hon. friend, was in Barra growing at a rate almost unexampled, there having been an increase of 40 per cent. in a few years. Was it kindness to encourage these poor people to squat upon the land, to raise these insanitary and unwholesome dwellings at their own cost, under no supervision of any sanitary officer, and with which no sanitary officer could interfere without raising discontent? The real fact was that they could only bring content to those islands by encouraging the people to leave a soil which was too poor to yield sustenance to an increasing population. They could not make those districts fertile and suitable for economical small holdings. The migration of the population was the only way in which an economic condition could be brought about. But what course had the right hon. Gentleman taken with regard to the state where the disorder had arisen? Certain cattle were placed upon the land against the wish of the tenants and against the wish of the landlords. There was a refusal to remove them. The people proceeded from that a step further; they built huts upon the land and established themselves as squatters. Such an attempt was certain to be uneconomic and a failure; how uneconomic was shown by the pamphlet which had been quoted, and most of the statements in which had been impugned by the hon. and learned Member. But those statements were founded upon plain facts, for which chapter and verse could be given. In regard to the extension of the squatting system in the Island of Vatersay, the right hon. Gentleman had been asked by Lady Gordon Cathcart to suggest a remedy. "Have you," she asked, "inquired whether there is a water supply on this island." No answer was given. The right hon. Gentleman prepared to institute an inquiry, but from that day to this he had never published the result of that inquiry. Lady Gordon Cathcart's own men of business had made the distinct statement that, according to their own surveyor, there was no water supply such as was necessary for a large population. That statement was not contravened by the Secretary for Scotland. The right hon. Gentleman was asked to make further inquiries, but he had declined, or, at all events, had failed to do so. Lady Gordon Cathcart said to the right hon. Gentleman: "If you desire to make this experiment, which I think entirely wrong, injurious to the people, against their best interests, likely to prove economically a failure, take the land yourself, or else pay compensation to my tenant, and divide it as you like; I will submit to your arrangement." But the tenant was not to be compensated adequately, and there was a refusal to purchase. Why a refusal to purchase? If the Secretary for Scotland thought he could manage this estate better than Lady Gordon Cathcart and her advisors, and if he thought that he would force her to establish an uneconomic, unthrifty, insalubrious, wasteful system in the island, was it fair on any ground or principle to say to her: "No; I shall not purchase. Take the responsibility, which will rest with you. I shall not compensate your tenant, but I shall leave you to try it." The right hon. Gentleman said: "Why should I relieve Lady Gordon Cathcart any more than I should relieve the landlord of a slum district in a town?" Yes; but the right hon. Gentleman had turned the district into a slum, or into something analogous. Lady Gordon Cathcart was not like some landlord in the slum area of a town who gathered his rents from an impecunious population. She had attempted to arrange matters on what she thought was an economic basis, which, in the long-run, would be the most healthful and beneficial for the inhabitants. It was the right hon. Gentleman, who was turning this district into a slum, who was creating conditions which would be insalubrious, with an insufficient quantity of water, with crowded dwellings, and with a soil from which no ingenuity or possible device could extort a living for the number planted upon it. Could anything be more unfair, more unequal, more unjust? After all, was not the landlord like any fellow being, entitled to something like justice? Was he to be compelled to establish what he was advised, from long experience, would be an uneconomic, wrongful, hurtful state of things, was he to be forced to bear the responsibility of it; was he not at least to be relieved of his land, of which they who pressed this arrangement upon him should take the responsibility themselves? But worse still. The right hon. Gentleman had avoided what was, after all, the strongest central point of this matter. Whatever they had done, he thought they had done wrong to the landlord, and on no moral ground could they support or defend their position. But they had done a far greater wrong. They had broken in the minds of these people any respect for the law upon which their good, as well as the good of the landlords, depended. He quite agreed that the islanders were a law-abiding and law-loving people. There was a singular absence of crime amongst them. For twenty miles they would see law and order preserved by the blue coat of the single policeman, who seldom had to interfere. What did that depend upon? It depended upon the fact that the policeman in his uniform was a symbol, no more than a symbol, but behind which was the power of the whole realm, which, however slowly it might move, the breaker of the law knew would eventually and relentlessly overtake him in protection of the society to which he belonged. The right hon. Gentleman had brought contempt for the law in place of respect for the law. He had, not only by his inaction, but by the positive encouragement that had been given by himself and his supporters and the law officers, shown these poor people that if they defied the law they would have sympathy in high places, and would ultimately find themselves, not only protected and free from any consequences which followed the infringement of property in other places, but that they would find that they were actually defended in asserting the right that they had lawlessly put in force, and that pressure of the most severe kind was brought to bear upon those who had been wronged by their action.

*SIR J. DEWAR (Inverness) said the Leader of the Opposition had stated that he suspected this was engineered by agitators. As he was the only politician who visited the island he must be the culprit. The advice he had all along given these men was that they should not break the law, and should not take possession of the land, but should continue constitutional agitation. But these men apparently knew better than he did. They knew that this was the only sort of argument that seemed to appeal to the management of this estate. There had been several instances mentioned where the management of the estate had given new holdings, but in every case it was preceded by an outbreak of what was called lawlessness. In 1900 they seized some land. Shortly afterwards the Secretary for Scotland in the Conservative Government bought land and divided it into small holdings. Afterwards the same thing took place in South Uist, and there an extension of the holdings took place. Could they blame the men when they saw that line taken by the management of the estate? He did not approve of their action or apologise for them, but he thought there was a great deal of excuse and explanation. He had nothing in the world to say against Lady Cathcart. She was in every respect a benevolent, kind, and considerate lady, who had done a great deal for these islands, and had done a great deal that they did not see or read about in the newspapers. He knew of his own knowledge that she had done a great deal for the people of the islands, but the management of the estate was very bad. As far as his experience went it was the only badly managed estate in the Highlands, and the only estate where there was any trouble, except, perhaps, on the Congested Districts own estate, and that was a proof that the State was always a bad landlord. He wished to draw attention to, not a misstatement but a half statement, made first by the Leader of the Opposition, and, secondly, by the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken. They seemed to suppose that the squatter cottars were all the younger sons of crofters. That was not the case. The proprietors of these estates in many cases had made the cottars. All these lands were peopled by crofters not so very long ago, and they were cleared off by the proprietors of the estates. They were turned from crofters into cottars, and their crofts were given to great farmers with sheep farms, and many of the crofters were compulsorily emigrated to Canada, and many of them were forced down to the sea shore and told, as they were to-day that they ought to make their living out of the sea, because the land could not give them a living. Lady Cathcart's predecessors cleared off in the year 1851 between 1,000 and 2,000 people. That was not a case in the dark ages. It was within the recollection of many people living in the island. One old man on a neighbouring island had told him that he remembered his father being taken away from his croft on the west side of the island in handcuffs and put down in a bog on the east side and made into a cottar, and that man's son was a cottar to-day. There were a great many cottars of that kind for whom the estate was directly responsible. These people since 1851 had constantly desired to get back to their holdings. A man had told him that as a young man he had expected to get a croft, and now that he had grey hair it seemed as far off as ever. That man was not the younger son of a crofter. The management of the estate had all along said it was a mistake to give them land. He did not think it was economically unsound, and the people themselves did not think so, and it could be proved that it was not. If they were compelled to buy land at 25 per cent. more than it was worth it was, of course, uneconomic, and the rents were uneconomic, and they could not afford to live on it. He had no doubt on the subject at all, and any unprejudiced witness would say the same thing. But where there had been settlements on economic grounds, and with some consideration both to the landlord and the tenant, they had been successful, and the people who were now occupying them were in a better position than before they got possession. The poor rate was high and the proportion of paupers was very large. But 90 per cent. of the paupers came from the cottar and the landless class, and only 10 per cent. from the class of men who had got land. He did not want to go into the record of the dealings of the estate with the Government, but a succession of Secretaries for Scotland had had dealings with these estates, and in every case had been more or less the victims of circumstances. In 1902 the estate which had been mentioned was purchased, one part by a tenant and the other by the Congested Districts Board. All along there had been an agitation for cottars to get a living as crofters, and this land was the best and most fertile in the district. But just before negotiations reached a head a long lease was granted to a tenant who said he would not give it up unless he was allowed to purchase his part of the estate, and he made his offer. The Secretary for Scotland was helpless and had to agree to the conditions, and the result was that the best part of the land was bought by the farmer and was consequently unavailable to relieve the congestion, and the crofters were sent to the moors and the bogs as usual, and they had there again the spectacle that they had in so many parts of the Highlands, of the crofter being on the poor soil and the farmer on the rich and fertile soil. Under all these circumstances he thought the Secretary for Scotland was justified in taking a stand on behalf of the taxpayer, and in refusing to do more than he did. But what was to be done to meet the present difficulty? They could not go on sending these men to prison, and keeping them there. It was a perfectly hopeless plan. It was impossible, and he was sure it would be repugnant to Lady Gordon Cathcart. He hoped most sincerely that the Government or the proprietors would again open negotiations. He did not think the Government should buy the land. All the power the Board had was to buy land and sell it over again in small holdings. It had been proved that the tenants did not want to buy. They had already refused to buy. He hoped negotiations would proceed and that they might get a settlement in the interests of the cottars. He agreed entirely that even if all the land was put in the hands of the crofters they would not have done all that ought to be done. No doubt there was a very large population there—larger perhaps than ought to be there—but he had great belief in the work that had been carried on by the Congested Districts Board in the matter of technical education, and he believed more ought to be done in that direction. The life of a West Highland crofter, was something like this: he went to school until the age of fourteen, then went home to his mother, and forgot all his English and a good deal of his learning in school. About eighteen he went south to find work, and being only fit for labouring work, the result usually was that in the end he found himself in the West Highlands, an old man, with no trade and no money saved, and became a charge on the over-burdened ratepayer.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further proceeding was postponed without Question put.

OYSTER AND MUSSEL FISHERY (BAY OF FIRTH) ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [BY ORDER].

Second Reading deferred till Wednesday next, at a quarter past Eight of the Clock.

SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1908-9).

Postponed Proceeding on Question proposed on consideration of Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,600, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the office of His Majesty's Secretary for Scotland and Subordinate Office, Expenses under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1900, and Expenses under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, including a Grant in Aid of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Fund."

Which Question was, "That a sum not exceeding £10,600, be granted for the said service,"—(*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson,*) —resumed.

SIR JOHN DEWAR, continuing, said the West Highland young man had no chance to learn a trade. He agreed that the Congested Districts Board was doing excellent work in teaching trades to some of the young men, and he hoped that that part of their work would be continued and encouraged. They did not want to drive the inhabitants of those islands away, but they wanted to induce the more enterprising and ambitious of the inhabitants to enter upon a wider sphere, and in order to fit them to battle with life they should try to make them better equipped than they were at the present time. They ought to do a good deal more to teach them trades, and the Congested Districts Board ought to be as active in this respect as they possibly could be. He was for giving as much land as possible to those men because that improved not only their social condition but improved them in every other respect. He urged the Government to enter into negotiations with the proprietors of those islands.

Sir J. Dewar.

MR. WILKIE (Dundee) said it appeared to be the practice of some hon. Members to commence their speeches by saying they were not going to take up much time, and then proceed to do just the opposite. He was not going to declare himself either way. There were two kinds of people in this world, those who were willing to work and those who were willing to let them. His experience of the House was that it contained two parties, those who were willing to legislate and those who were not willing to let them. Last session he put in many hours on the Scottish Committee upon the land question, and if that Bill had been allowed to pass this trouble would never have arisen. The people on whose behalf he rose to protest were anxious to get a little bit of land to live upon, and they had been called by the Leader of the Opposition parasites. All he wished to say was that if those parasites who prevented the land legislation passing last session had allowed the Bill to go through the present difficulty would never have occurred at all. He was not going to enter into any tirade against Lady Cathcart. He did not know her, but he had read the statement issued by her clever agent, and if that was all the case they could make out for her, then he thought it was a very bad case indeed. It appeared to him that they were now repeating the history of that particular island of 1851, when the people were driven from the land of their birth to seek a living in Canada in order to give place to deer and sheep. No wonder the Secretary of State for War under these circumstances was complaining of the want of success of his Territorial Army. In this particular part of Scotland in the past men of stamina and strength were reared, who had proved to be the bulwark of this country in time of danger, and yet they had been compelled to make room for sheep and deer. They had been told that in Scotland they had some good landlords. He almost wished that they had not had those good landlords, because if they had not existed the present system would have been swept away long ago. The inhabitants of those islands were sick of waiting for a little bit of land upon which to spend their energy; they were being driven to the mainland, and would prefer to suffer imprisonment rather than starve. Why did they continue a system which inflicted such hardships upon the people? He thought in this matter the Government ought to take their courage in both hands, and take over all those islands and be done with the difficulty. That would incur far less cost to this country and it would be a mere bagatelle, because at the present time they had to go to the expense of having gunboats and ironclads around those islands in order to protect the interests of the landlords. He had been asked by his own constituents to intervene in this discussion. He desired to urge the Government to take the wider and bolder step, and if they found that their legislation was not passed by the other House he hoped they would make this a financial question, and have all those islands placed under Government, thus settling the question once for all. Let them put human life before the interests of mere property or deer.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said that personally he regretted that instead of having a discussion upon the local affairs of Scotland they had had only a party political debate on a particular land question. That had, to some extent, deprived them of the time they had hoped to have to consider many other affairs affecting social government and other matters which came under the Scottish Office. With regard to the Vatersay question he thought the Government ought to have done something. It was the duty of the Government to govern, and when they had in power a Government with such a large majority it was their duty to find out some means of getting over a difficulty of this sort instead of letting the people starve and be sent to prison. They were told that the difficulty was in regard to compensation to the tenants. But they had not been told how much it was. He was afraid that the Government had been standing too much on their dignity, and would not move in the matter because the other parties did not come to them. A Liberal Government ought to be above that sort of thing, and should endeavour to do what was right without regard to mere dignity of office. There were few places in the Highlands of Scotland where there was congestion. There was congestion in Lewis, but that could not be said of Sutherlandshire, where the population was less now than it was 100 years ago. If the people could get the land in that county, it would support 50,000 more than were there at present. It should be remembered that the land had practically all been stolen from the clans within almost living memory. None of those who got possession of it after 1745 had any real title to it, except the fact that they had collected rents since then. He was told that Edinburgh lawyers had made up various titles for them in the same way as certain titles had been got up in London. The land formerly belonged to the clans who paid small tribute to the chiefs and no doubt had to perform certain duties in connection with their clans. Unfortunately, a good deal of the land had been sold to other individuals. He did not say that Lady Cathcart or her immediate predecessors had stolen the land. Undoubtedly, unless the land question was settled in the interest of the people, the people might say presently: "We will resume possession of our own, and you may look out for payment where you like." The people all over Scotland were law-abiding, and they were willing to pay a fair rent for the land with fixity of tenure. That they now offered, but they might not always offer it. As to the poor men who were now in prison in connection with the Vatersay affair, he asked why the Government could not reduce the sentences. It should be quite satisfactory, so far as the law was concerned, if, having been convicted, they were given twenty-four hours imprisonment. That would have vindicated the law. He might remind the Committee that when a rich American shot some gillies in the Highlands he was not even found guilty. He asked hon. Members to look at the difference between the treatment of the poor men at Vatersay and the treatment of the rich American. Why should not the Government intervene and say that the law had been vindicated, and that the men should be released, so that they might go back to work, so that their families should not starve? Some people were surprised that there should be any sympathy with these men. There was bound to be sympathy with them in view of the way they were treated, and of the fact that they were not allowed to work for a living. They were willing to work in the cultivation of the land if they were only allowed to do so. It was the duty of the Government, and especially a Liberal Government, to see that something was done whereby people could be allowed to get a living. A Liberal Government had been in power for nearly three sessions, and what had they done for Scotland? Three years ago they were told by the Lord-Advocate that Scotland must wait. Well, Scotland was waiting, and he hoped the Government would endeavour in some way to deal with the needs of the Highland population. He was perfectly certain that something could be done by the Congested Districts Board. That Board had a balance last year of about £40,000. Therefore, it could not be said that there was no money to deal with the question. If there was no other means of dealing with the question, it was certainly the duty of the Congested Districts Board to employ the money which they had in hand for the purposes on which they were authorised to spend it. Why did the Board not do that? If they did not do it, why did not the Secretary for Scotland make them? He himself had continually complained that the Congested Districts Board had abstained from doing a great deal that Parliament evidently meant them to do. The late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman said in 1905 that it would be the duty of the Liberal Government to colonise our own country. So far as the congested districts of the Highlands were concerned, that work was in the hands of the Secretary for Scotland and the Congested Districts Board. There was a great deal of work which might be done in building necessary piers and harbours, making roads, and providing steamboat services. Since 1906 he had been asking the Board to carry out a great many improvements in Sutherland which admittedly they had power to do, but they had not done anything. The Secretary for Scotland ought to ask them to do something, or ask the House to get rid of these officials. He had pleasure in acknowledging the work which the Postmaster had done in improving the mail services in the Highlands. What the Postmaster-General had done showed that a great deal could be achieved by way of administration to help the people without coming to Parliament at all. He hoped the Postmaster-General would do more, and he (Mr. Morton) thanked him for what he had done. He could not associate himself with the hon. Member for Dumfries Burghs in congratulating the Secretary for Scotland on the amount of work he did. His own opinion was that the right hon. Gentleman did not do enough. They could not get him to answer letters himself as other Ministers did. His Department sent no written reply to the Questions which were addressed to him as other Departments did. The Congested Districts Board had taken away a steamboat service which was formerly provided between Lochinver and Loch Clash.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (Mr. CALDWELL, Lanarkshire, Mid.): That comes under the Post Office Vote.

*MR. MORTON said the steamboat service was put on by the Congested Districts Board in the autumn of 1905, and taken off early in 1906. The Secretary for Scotland was responsible for the action of the Board, and, therefore, he believed he was in order in discussing the matter now.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has himself given an answer on the point of order. It is because there is no money asked in the Vote for the steamboat service that he cannot discuss the matter now.

*MR. MORTON said his complaint was that the Board had got the money and had kept it. The Congested Districts Board had £20,000 on this Vote. However, as those matters were found to be out of order, and there was no other way of discussing them, he would put Questions on the Paper. He had been endeavouring to get those reforms, which were more administrative than anything else, by writing letters to the Secretary for Scotland, but he found the letters were of no use, and, therefore, he would trouble the House by putting Questions. He had another complaint to make. The Secretary for Scotland did nothing himself but blocked all attempts on the part of private Members to promote legislation with regard to trawling and other matters. He trusted that the Secretary for Scotland would endeavour to get the Congested Districts Board to do something with the money which they were going to vote that night to carry out the wishes of Parliament, and assist those districts. That was not only necessary to prevent their depopulation, but to allow the districts to be made fit for a much larger population than now existed there. If they gave the people of Sutherland the use of land, as was recommended by the Deer Forest Commission, and as they had the power to do, they would do much better service than by driving the people to the large towns and cities. Apart from the land question he had been asking for a steamboat service from Tongue to Lochinver, so that the people might have an opportunity of sending their spare produce to market. He had met with no success from the Congested Districts Board, and he would be inclined to refuse this £20,000, unless they spent some of it in that direction. He was certain that it was the duty of any Government, and especially of a Liberal Government, to do something whereby the people could get an honest and decent living. It was not a question of money in this country. They could vote money by millions for all sorts of purposes abroad, and what they wanted was the Government to spend money in order to colonise our own land and make it useful, and for the benefit of the people who tried to live on it.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The hon. Gentleman is going very wide of this Vote.

*MR. MORTON said that they could not take this £20,000 to South Africa; they wanted some of it spent in Sutherlandshire to carry out various improvements required to enable the people to get a livelihood and to protect human life. He wanted some of the money to assist in building boat-slips, piers, and other matters which were useful for the people. He had no intention of saying anything offensive of any Minister. It was the system he objected to, and because the best was not done with the money voted by Parliament. He regretted that the Secretary for Scotland was not present. He had seen him look in and go away again. He supposed the right hon. Gentleman was rather afraid of discussion, and he was sorry to say anything to cause him to run away. He never ran away himself, and he would have liked the Secretary for Scotland to remain and answer his questions, for, after all, Ministers were not the masters, but the servants of the people, and of this House particularly. There was another matter to which he wished to call attention. That was the sentence of five years penal servitude passed on a man named Simpson for doing something in Glasgow. Several Questions had been put to the Secretary for Scotland on the subject, and he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to reduce that sentence. They had been unable to get any explanation, in answer to questions put to the right hon. Gentleman, and it seemed a very hard case. A petition had been signed by over 40,000 people in Scotland and sent to the Government late last year or early this year, asking for a reduction of the sentence. So far as he could ascertain from reading up the case, he did not think that the Court had got hold of the right individual; he believed that this man Simpson had been made to a large extent a scapegoat. When they considered the light sentences passed in many other cases, five years seemed a hard sentence; and he would ask the Secretary for Scotland, when he came back from his tour round the House, to try and be merciful in this case, and recommend some reduction of this harsh sentence. The young man was ruined in any case, but when he compared his with other sentences—he did not want to mention other people's names—imposed at trials at Edinburgh, he thought it was the harshest sentence he had ever heard of. He would like to hear some reason why the Secretary for Scotland could not be merciful in this case. He also trusted that something would be done to reduce the sentence on the ten poor men who were in prison over the Vatersay case. Bearing in mind that nobody seemed to know who was to blame in that matter—some said it was one person, and some said it was another, and some blamed the Government—and seeing that the law had been sufficiently sustained by the conviction, he hoped the Secretary for Scotland would be merciful and release the men so that they might get to work at home. These men were only too anxious to work for their families and to be allowed an opportunity of doing it, which they could do as well as anyone in the world. Again he expressed a hope that the Secretary for Scotland would be merciful.

*MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said that before the discussion came to an end he should like to say, in support of what had fallen from the hon. Member for Inverness-shire, that it was absolutely necessary that a case like Vatersay should be dealt with immediately. It was only typical of what might happen where there was extreme poverty on the one hand and a desire to remain in their own country on the other. Since the failure of the Government to get a proper Land Bill passed, suggestions had been made from all parts of this House and in another place in regard to the matter. No doubt much had taken place at Vatersay which was to be regretted. He did not want to speak about the estate management. They all sympathised with the lady who was placed in the position of proprietress, and who had to go to lawyers and factors for her information. It was not to be wondered at that there was great difficulty in getting anything done. What was wanted was better machinery, as that which existed had broken down. The Scottish Office could do nothing; the Congested Districts Board could only act by buying the island and reselling it to the cottars; the Crofters Commission and the county council of Inverness-shire had also completely failed to make a settlement. All this was proof that new and improved machinery was wanted. He represented the constituency adjoining that where this occurrence had taken place, and he could confirm every word that had fallen in regard to the matter from hon. Members on that side of the House. The Leader of the Opposition had said that all the difficulty had arisen from the fact that the cottars had no right to be at Vatersay. Why were they there? It was because they were the descendants of the men who had occupied the soil in former generations. And he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that it was to that population that we owed a very large share of our Indian and Colonial Empire. Many hon. Members had seen the long list of public men, distinguished soldiers, and Governors-General who came from the West Highlands and had fought our battles in all parts of the world, not only with sword and rifle, but with axe and spade. The Leader of the Opposition said that these men had no right to be there; but where were they going to put them? What was wanted was better machinery. The Leader of the Opposition said that these men had no right to be where they were, and he asked what was going to be done with them. It should be the duty of the House next session to answer that question. It was absurd to say that there was no future for them there and that they must either drift into the towns or find their way across the seas. We wanted these people there. It would be a suicidal act if we did not keep alive the old home in the old country, where they could have an opportunity of bringing up their children mentally, morally and physically better fitted to become useful citizens of the Empire than would be the case if they were forced into the crowded streets of a large town——

Mr. MOLTENO (Dumfriesshire) said the Leader of the Opposition had told the Committee that these men had been led away by agitators to commit a breach of the law. That was a most unfortunate remark, because nothing could be found in the documents before the Committee in any way to justify such a statement. There was a great deal in the Report to suggest the opposite. This had been represented as a raid and an unprincipled demand by these men on the land of their neighbour, but what were the facts? The Sheriff was sent down to investigate, and he very wisely did not go down escorted by gunboats, he went down quietly with his wife and saw these people. The leader of the movement was a fisherman named Duncan Campbell, whom he saw and spent three hours in conversation with. Eventually Duncan Campbell took him to Vatersay in his boat, and showed him what had been done. That was not the action of a criminal. He asked Campbell why he had done what he had, and Campbell's reply was that he and the others could not hope to find occupation in their country; that he had worked hard all his life but had got nothing; that neither from Lady Cathcart nor from the Congested Districts Board could he get help; that their fathers and grandfathers had been possessed of these very lands in the past; and that these men had never given up their claim to them. Yet the hon. Member for Lanarkshire had said that these men had gone there without a shadow of a right. The Sheriff said he had thought it right to give Campbell's statement in detail as being the best way to bring to the mind of the Secretary for Scotland the true character of this raid. The Congested Districts Board also sent down a Commissioner, who said that he found the people moderate in their talk and spirit and other circumstances, and that the want of potatoes among those having families must be a very great hardship. From the evidence of the Report, therefore, the Committee would see that the idea that these people were led by agitators to come forward in this manner was erroneous. The facts of this case broadly were that the greater part of these islands was tenanted by three or four large farmers, and that the other inhabitants lived among the rocks and streams and bogs. These men were the descendants of those who used to have the whole. They took the proper steps. They applied to the representatives of the landowner and obtained no satisfaction; they went to the parish councils, who endeavoured to assist them and were unsuccessful; they then went to the county council, who sent down a deputation who spent nine days in investigation, and confirmed the report of the Sheriff. They reported th t land was desirable, that it could be got, but that it was impossible to get it on reasonable terms. These people had gone to every authority, and they finally pointed out that if they went back to Barra it meant starvation; that it meant leaving their country or starving. Under these circumstances it was very hard that suggestions should be made that political motives actuated these men. It was simply the effect of the laws. The system of landlord and tenant had broken down. It had operated unfairly. These men were the product of injustice in the past. He did not blame the landlords but the system. It was the system which had produced this difficulty; it was not the result of action such as was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. There were no shops. If these people wanted milk they had to keep their cow; if they wanted carrots or potatoes they must grow them. A small amount of land was to them an economic necessity. The difficulty was not peculiar to this part; it had arisen all over Scotland. In the three most southern counties of Scotland, Berwick, Roxburgh, and Edinburgh, in the last thirty or forty years the agricultural labourers had been driven out, whilst in the Highlands the rural population had decreased enormously. In every county of Scotland this had been the case; therefore it was not a thing confined to this particular spot. The Leader of the Opposition said that these men should not be there! Then where should they be? They were the decendants of the people on the spot. The right hon. Gentleman also complained that they had been unduly prolific; but the increase had only been 37 per cent. in forty years, which was the proportion all over Scotland, so that that charge could not be made against them. This process had been going on for many years. Adam Smith drew attention to it in his time and pointed out how disastrous it was. Sir John Stanley drew attention to it also. They were really in the face of a great social problem as to the existing land system. It was that which had created the difficulty. This was one of many cases which had occurred in the past, and ought to be very carefully considered by the House. It was suggested that the Small Landholders Bill of last year would have met the case. That suggestion was based upon a misunderstanding of the Bill. He thought the Secretary for Scotland was perfectly correct in taking up the firm attitude he had done, and he hoped he would maintain that attitude and that a settlement might be arrived at.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs) thought everybody in the House sympathised with the poor misguided men who were in prison. There was no doubt that if they had not been misled they would not be where they were now. He did not want to indulge in recriminations. The Government, he thought, had received its full share of the blame, and he would rather let bygones be bygones and direct the attention of the House to what was going to happen when the men came out of prison. They were martyrs to-day; but in a few days they would be heroes. He did not know how it was going to end, but he certainly thought it was the duty of the Government to face the possibilities of the future. They did one thing which everyone would agree was wise. They sent down the Sheriff, Mr. Wilson, to see what could be done. He had no doubt he did his best; and everybody would regret that he failed to accomplish his object. He suggested two alternatives. The first was that of allowing Lady Cathcart to work her remedy as she pleased, and the second was to let the Congested Districts Board buy either the island of Vatersay or such part of it as Lady Cathcart would part with on reasonable terms so that they might give allotments. This might involve a capital expenditure of £6,000 or £8,000 and should, Mr. Wilson supposed, only be contemplated if the island was reported upon by a competent man as suitable for the settlement of crofters as regarded the water supply. What had the Government done to discover whether the water supply was right or not? They had not heard what the Government had done to find out whether the island was fit for crofters or not. So far, they knew nothing. Were they for the sake of £6,000 or £8,000 to set the heather on fire? He thought it would be a world of pities, and he most earnestly implored the Government to take heart of grace and put an end to this discreditable and lamentable state of affairs.

Mr. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said he had heard many strange theories in his time, but the most interesting theory he had ever heard was that which came from the Leader of the Opposition that night, in referring to these particular islanders. The right hon. Gentleman had said that they were parasites, and had given as his reason that they were unable to provide for their own wants and the needs of ordinary civilisation. If men who were unable to do that were to be called parasites, the right hon. Gentleman need not go to the Highlands to discover them. He would find many of them on the other side of that building. This was a great subject, and yet it was contained within a narrow compass. The hon. Member for St. Andrews Burghs had said that the men who were in prison were martyrs to-day, and that to-morrow they would be heroes. In the ordinary course of his duties, possibly as an agitator, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, he would be within the zone of this disaffected area in the coming recess. He knew very well the class from whom these men had sprung. They were not likely to be inflamed by the oratory of any agitator who might go into their midst. They were a body of men slow to move, who thought and reasoned for themselves, whose whole conduct demonstrated that they had tried every method before going to the length of breaking the law. The House was told that they were law-breakers, but, if so, who made them law-breakers? The men who compelled them to break the law were the men who had created the situation. They or their ancestors had driven these men off the land. In this case they had a titled lady who, to his mind, was the Clanricarde of the Highlands. She possessed 14,000 acres of land, and there was a population of 2,500. They wanted to follow the pursuits of their fathers and live on the land. She said they should not do so unless they complied with her terms. The Government had tried to make arrangements, and had made proposals. She had made counter proposals, and would not alter them; the result was that the men were exasperated; bound by all the ties of kinship and love of country, they had been driven to desperation, and that night they were languishing in gaol, because they asked a fellow-creature the right to live. It did not suit her ladyship. It possibly did not suit her inclination, and, when a person would deliberately force upon these men this sad alternative, he could come to only one conclusion, viz., that she had not much interest in their welfare. It was the future they had to deal with. He regretted that the Government had endorsed the sentences, which to his mind were vicious in the extreme. The Government could with justice and without any dereliction of duty have reduced the sentences. If they did not do so, the men would come out with a sense of outraged justice, and when these men were roused gunboats would not cow them. These were the kind of men who made civil wars. It would be highly improper and foolish in the extreme for the Government to hold out no hope to these people that there would be an improvement in their future conditions. They did not ask for affluence; they were content with a frugal living. He appealed to the Government in the interests of law and order to give some hope, so that, instead of being firebrands when they emerged from prison, they would be the messengers of hope that land would be given, that they would have the right to earn their living, and that everything would be done to bring contentment and peace to unhappy people who were law-abiding and a credit to the country.

*Mr. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs) thought the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had really struck the right note. So far the debate had not been satisfactory because no practical proposal had been advocated on either side as to the way in which the situation should be dealt with. They had had a certain amount of eulogy of Lady Cathcart and a certain amount of denunciation of the Government. It was remarkable that though the Leader of the Opposition had in January last at Glasgow attacked the Lord Advocate in violent language, he had not embraced the opportunity afforded by that day's debate to engage that learned Gentleman at close quarters. What had the Government done? What could it do? It could not enforce the provisions of the Bill which was lost in another place. It did not want to put in force the provisions of the Act of 1865, which had been passed for a totally different purpose. But there was going to be a great deal more of this kind of thing if some remedy was not applied.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: If you ask me what I want the Government to do, I want them to accept the recommendations of Mr. Wilson and buy Vatersay for from £6,000 to £8,000. That would put an end to the whole trouble.

*Mr. ANNAN BRYCE said people did not want purchase in Scotland. They had seen from the examples of the island of Skye and Sutherlandshire that purchase by the Congested Districts Board was not a method of settlement which commended itself to the crofter population. What they wanted was to be able to hire their land on reasonable terms.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Well, the Government can hire it to them.

*Mr. ANNAN BRYCE said the proposals of the Government to Lady Cathcart were not accepted. The Government made proposals to that effect which failed owing to the impossible conditions which were attached by Mr. Macdonald, the agent.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY said it only failed on the question of compensation to the tenants, which the Secretary for Scotland said was a bagatelle. Why they could not face the bagatelle he did not know.

*Mr. ANNAN BRYCE said the Secretary for Scotland had pointed out that that was really quite a subsidiary matter, but the really important matters were the other conditions which were attached. The Congested Districts Board had not the right to hold land in the way in which alone these people would have it, and they would require legislation to enable the recommendation of the hon. Member to be carried out. What they wanted now was some hope to be expressed by the Lord Advocate as to the way in which the Government was going to treat the question. He did not know why the hon. and gallant Member should call these people misguided. Who misguided them?

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Some of your Party.

*Mr. ANNAN BRYCE said he was not aware of any agitators ever having gone to Barra to mislead the people.

Sir J. DEWAR: I am the only politician who visits the island and my advice to them is not to break the law.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I meant nothing personal, and I should like to apologise if I gave that idea.

*Mr. ANNAN BRYCE said that all through the debate it had been assumed by speakers on the other side that the Government were somehow to blame for the present position. The Government had no blame whatever. They had done nothing to mislead except by trying to pass legislation which hon. Gentlemen opposite had helped to destroy. That was the only misleading that had been done by the Government, and he did not think any reasonable person would say that that was a kind of thing which ought to be thrown in their teeth. The hon. Member for the Universities who had accused the Government of having encouraged these people to break the law seemed to forget that this was not the first time that breaches of the law of this kind had been perpetrated. The little pamphlet issued by the friends of Lady Cathcart showed that the same kind of thing had been going on on a large number of occasions before. The Government had no responsibility and he thought the Secretary for Scotland was fully justified in his disclaimer of any intention to accept the responsibility. The words of Sheriff Wilson in his Report showed that these unfortunate people were fully justified morally in the action they took. They had no other course to adopt. It made one's blood boil to read the kind of conditions under which these unhappy people lived in this island. There was a clause in the letter which Sheriff Wilson saw, written by Mr. Macdonald, Lady Cathcart's local factor, to a cottar, which really showed what the grievance at the bottom of the matter was. The last sentence of the letter was this—

> "If you persist in building, the erection will be pulled down forcibly, or Lady Cathcart's agents will take immediate action against you, as house building by cottars in the immediate vicinity is no longer to be tolerated."

They were living in insanitary conditions, and when they attempted to obtain a spot of ground on which they could live in a healthy way they were imprisoned for contempt of Court. Every word of the Report fully justified morally the action of those unhappy people, and he hoped they would have an indication from the Lord Advocate of some possible kind of remedy.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL for SCOTLAND (Mr. Ure, Linlithgowshire) said the Papers which had been placed before the Committee disclosed, it was said, a case of harsh and unjust treatment, and the accusation would be found to rest on two quite separate and distinct grounds which it was eminently desirable to keep separate and distinct. The first was that the Government had refused to put in operation the Tinkers Act against certain men who had planted thirteen plots of potatoes on two acres of ground. These men were perfectly well known to the proprietress. They had been born and bred on the estate. They were not tinkers, but sensible, reasonable, courteous men holding the view that if land was not to be had they were entitled against the wishes of the proprietress to take possession of it, and they were the men against whom they were asked to take criminal proceedings, and to brand as criminals. That they absolutely declined to do, because the offence they committed was quite obviously a civil offence for which the law provided ample remedy. If the proprietrix took steps they must be in the Civil Court. It was said they would be costly and troublesome, but that was no justification whatever for the Government taking criminal proceedings. This proprietrix was in exactly the same position as hundreds of other proprietors, that there was no Sheriff's Court or Sheriff's Officer at hand. Secondly, they were told that this proprietrix deserved more than usual consideration at the hands of the Government because she had carried generosity to its utmost limit in her treatment of her tenants. But that would never be listened to for a moment as a ground for taking criminal proceedings. Upon looking back on the situation the Lord Advocate and he were satisfied that they had come to a right conclusion in advising the Secretary for Scotland that this was not a case in which the criminal law should be set in motion. He did not deny that they took a much wider view than the mere narrow legal aspect of the question. They had naturally to consider what the effect of taking criminal proceedings would be upon the sentiment and the feelings of the people, and whether or no taking criminal proceedings held out any reasonable hope of immediate restoration of law and order, and they came to the conclusion that it would act in exactly the opposite way, and that if they desired to foment exasperation and intensify the feeling of injustice and wrong which these men undoubtedly cherished they could not take a surer or straighter course than to call in the police. On that resolution they looked back with supreme satisfaction, because all the events which had subsequently taken place justified it. The very paltriness of the remedy of fourteen days imprisonment or 20s. fine was enough to bring the whole thing into contempt and exasperate these people. If, as he believed, it was the object of Lady Gordon Cathcart and her advisers to impress these men with the serious view she took of the situation, proceedings in the Civil Court were much better calculated to secure that end than calling in the aid of the police. The Tinkers Act was never intended to apply to such a case, and if it had been, for twenty-one years it would have been applied by any landed proprietor in the outer Hebrides and every crofter would be liable to be removed. The second accusation against the Government was that they absolutely refused to give compensation to the tenant on the condition of his surrendering his lease. A clamorous demand had been made by the cottars for crofts in Vatersay and, rightly or wrongly, these men had asked for land on which to cultivate their potatoes and feed their cows, and they planted themselves on the ground. The Government agreed at once to pay the diminished value of the remainder of the land after crofts had been carved out of it, but they refused to pay a wholly undefined and indefinable sum for compensation, which should be a mere bagatelle, but would have grown to an enormous amount if it were known that the Government were going to be responsible. They still desired that the scheme of carving out crofts should be adopted ultimately, so that homes might be provided for the cottars. With regard to the case alluded to by the hon. Member for Sutherland where a sentence of five years penal servitude had been imposed, the man had been found guilty of one of the gravest offences ever brought before a Criminal Court. He did not think the punishment was unduly severe under the circumstances. The evidence was exceedingly clear. The prisoner took advantage of the recent Act, and gave evidence on his own behalf, but he was nevertheless found guilty by the jury. He did not think under those circumstances his right hon. friend was wrong in refusing to mitigate the sentence.

MR. MORTON: Was it not a question of the handwriting?

MR. URE said there was no doubt whatever about the handwriting.

*MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) contended that the Trespass Act of 1865 absolutely fitted the case under discussion. In 1891 a similar case arose, and the raiders were brought before the sheriff, who said that to take possession of land for which a man was paying rent was pure robbery. Those men were sent to prison for fourteen days, and the raid came to an end. That was a far more satisfactory way of dealing with a case of the kind than by procedure in a Civil Court, and he did not doubt that the men who were now languishing in prison wished that the Lord Advocate had taken the view of his predecessor, and had dealt with their case under the Trespass Act, with its maximum penalty of £1 or fourteen days imprisonment. He was surprised at the argument of the Solicitor-General for Scotland on the compensation claim of the tenant. Why did the Government refuse to pay compensation to the tenant who was dispossessed of his farm? The Solicitor-General said it would be an undefined claim. Not long ago the learned Attorney-General took part in the debate upon the Land Tenure Bill of 1906, in which the fullest provisions were inserted as to arbitration for a tenant in regard to compensation for being deprived of his farm. Was that what the Solicitor-General now called an undefined claim when it had been made the subject of arbitration? When the hon. and learned Member reflected he would see that he had produced a very false analogy. Here was a case where a tenant had had more than one lease of his farm. He had paid his rent regularly and was anxious to remain on his farm, but to meet the situation he was willing to give it up. In every case where they got rid of a tenant, even at the end of a lease, compensation had to be paid. That was what the Solicitor-General for Scotland called an undefined claim, and that was the sole reason why the Secretary for Scotland had felt himself unable to deal with the case by way of compensation. It was a misfortune that there were no trades for the crofters, who were a fine, well-mannered people, but occasionally their intelligence was clouded by strange notions upon land tenure. In regard to the fishing industry they did not show that persistent, continuous adherence to it which was exhibited on the East coast of Scotland.

MR. WEIR: They have no harbours.

Mr. Cochrane.

*MR. COCHRANE said he did not want to criticise them too severely. He was glad to see that the Congested Districts Board were endeavouring to do something for those young fellows. They had sent over 100 of them to cities like Glasgow and Greenock and endeavoured to apprentice them to trades. Those young fellows had not, however, been brought up to the work, and they were inclined to throw it up. The main thing that was wanted to encourage this experiment was more money. The air of romance which invested the crofters had characterised many of the statements made by hon. Members opposite during the debate, in which charges had been made that could not be substantiated or justified. Even the Secretary for Scotland had made the extraordinary statement that his principal reason for not settling with the tenant as to compensation was that the proprietor and tenant had entered into a new lease and that they should not have entered into a new lease because they knew perfectly well that there were trespassers on the land.

MR. SINCLAIR: I said that they entered into it at their own risk, knowing all the circumstances.

*MR. COCHRANE: Exactly so; and he thought that they should not have entered into it because they knew they were threatened with trespassers and cattle on the land. Did they not also know that there was a law in the land? At the end of a lease of a Highland sheep farm the landlord had to take over the sheep stock at a valuation, and by a custom which had grown up an artificial valuation was put upon the sheep stock. It was called the acclimatisation value, and it sometimes exceeded the actual value of the flock. Many a Highland landlord had been ruined in the process. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would take a fair and just view of the matter. They were asked by the Solicitor-General whether their view was that the Government should have taken criminal proceedings. His answer was no, but there were many steps which might have been taken before entering on criminal proceedings, and which would have been effective.

What happened in Vatersay? Lady Gordon Cathcart arranged with the tenant of Vatersay to let twenty acres of land for potatoes. In a letter to the Congested Districts Board dated 15th March, 1906, it was pointed out that "The tenant relied on the Government preventing any invasion of his farm such as had been publicly threatened." The agitation for more land continued, and Lady Cathcart relied on the Government preventing the invasion of the farm and protecting the farmer. When the land was seized the Secretary for Scotland had an opportunity for saying to these people in plain language that their action was illegal in invading the land, and that the Government would not support them in such action. When asked to put the matter before the people in that way, the Secretary for Scotland absolutely refused to take that course. The Congested Districts Board also farmed land in Scotland, and they were threatened with trespass. A meeting was held at which a resolution was passed that a raid should be made on the farm of Kilmuir. The Secretary for Scotland was asked by the intending raiders in the most naif manner whether he approved of this raid, and the reply of the right hon. Gentleman was a curious commentary on the enforcement of the law. He said that the illegal seizure of land could receive no assent at the hands of the Government and would entail most serious consequences. In that case the land was the property of the Congested Districts Board. He had not the right hon. Gentleman's exact words, but that was a paraphrase of what he said. That was wise action to take, and he believed it had a most salutary effect. These people were, so far as he knew, deterred from taking the action which they intended to take. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman in the case of Lady Cathcart's land give the Vatersay people the same strenuous warning as was given in the case of those who proposed to take the land of the Congested Districts Board? Lady Cathcart asked the Secretary for Scotland or the Lord Advocate to put down lawlessness and protect the tenant, or to purchase the farm and compensate him. Exactly the same words were used by the sheriff who was sent down by the Secretary for Scotland. Then Lady Cathcart said while the civil action was pending that she desired to make a final effort to bring about a settlement so that these misguided people might be saved the penalties which would be imposed by the Court. Some vague and unsatisfactory proposals were made in regard to the sheep stock. The Secretary for Scotland said he had no doubt that the Congested Districts Board would be prepared to purchase at a valuation. Lady Cathcart had been in the same predicament before. She sold some land which was to be devoted to the use of the crofters, but the crofters would not take it up. She had to compensate the tenant, and take over the sheep stock at a valuation and the Board did not pay her back. Then there was an unfortunate experience in regard to a school, and the result was that Lady Cathcart had to provide the school herself. In regard to all these matters the right hon. Gentleman had, perhaps, hardly dealt in a generous manner with Lady Cathcart. He thought the tenant came extraordinarily well out of the whole circumstances. The tenant said he was willing to renounce the lease if he got compensation, and a price for the sheep on his tenancy after valuation by arbitration. He thought those were very reasonable terms. Moreover, the tenant said he was willing to come to Edinburgh to see the Secretary for Scotland or any member of the Board and explain his terms. That was a fair and reasonable proposal. The Secretary for Scotland gave a blank negative; and the right hon. Gentleman was largely and seriously to blame for all that had subsequently taken place. Lady Gordon Cathcart was perfectly right in what she said. She was not prepared to compensate the tenant because she did not wish to remove him; and he did not see why she should be called upon to make an experiment which she had every reason to apprehend would be a failure. That was her past experience, and he hoped, from something that had fallen from the Secretary for Scotland, that he might alter his mind on this point about paying compensation. He regretted some things that had happened and that there had been something in the nature of a campaign against Lady Gordon Cathcart. He was certain that hon. Members who knew the district must be aware that she had earnestly done her best to meet an extremely difficult situation. Questions had been asked in the House that contained insinuations and covert attacks upon a lady who had no means of replying, and no opportunity of putting her case rightly before the House. [An HON. MEMBER: What Questions?] There was one Question by the hon. Baronet the Member for Inverness-shire. Generally, it stated that the proprietor of Vatersay owned the whole of the Island of Barra, and that all attempts by the cottars to obtain land by peaceable means had failed. Anybody who knew the facts knew that that was not true. When Lady Cathcart got possession of the island 8,000 acres were held by crofters. At present there were 15,500 acres held by crofters, leaving only about 3,350 acres in her own possession. Could she do more, or could it be said with truth that the proprietress owned the land in the neighbourhood and that she had refused all attempts to obtain land for the cottars? Was that a fair way to describe the position? The right hon. Gentleman, in answer to that question said: "Stated generally, the facts are as stated." He thought some clearer statement might have been given by the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College) said that he had asked a Question in regard to reduction of rents because he wanted to get the accurate facts in view of this debate.

*MR. COCHRANE said that the Question might have been put at a more convenient time instead of immediately before the debate, when a very full and emphatic answer might have been given. He was, however, not aware of the Question put by the hon. Member. He was referring to the Question put by the hon. Baronet the Member for Invernessshire as to 120 years purchase having been paid for land at Vatersay when the Secretary for Scotland said he could not commit himself to rapid calculations. The right hon. Gentleman must have been aware that the calculation would not have taken four minutes.

MR. A. DEWAR said that he asked the Question as to 120 years purchase having been paid by the Government.

*MR. COCHRANE: For what?

MR. A. DEWAR: For sixty acres of land which had been let at 2s. an acre.

*MR. COCHRANE: These sixty acres were carved out of the best part of the farm.

MR. A. DEWAR: No, they were not.

*MR. COCHRANE said that they were a portion of the farm and the tenant had a right to put a considerable value upon those 60 acres. The hon. Member said that the 120 years purchase was at the average rent of the whole farm of some thousands of acres. The sixty acres had been used for growing potatoes; and the value of these acres was taken as the average value of the whole farm. When the Question was asked, the Secretary for Scotland said he was not a rapid calculator and could not give an Answer. At any rate he might have said that he had sent down an impartial valuator of his own from the Congested Districts Board and that his valuation of the sixty acres coincided with the purchase price. The right hon. Gentleman in the advocacy of his case should have been more moderate in his statements and not have said that the question could not be answered. The purchase price was £10 an acre or £600, and out of that the tenant had to receive compensation by way of re-adjustment of terms. When the lease expired the tenant said that that was the most valuable portion of his farm, and that was confirmed when the proprietor and factor agreed with the tenant to reduce the rent on account of these 60 acres, from £400 to £350. Was that 120 years purchase?

MR. A. DEWAR said that this was a peninsula isolated from the farm, swept by wind in every direction. They said it was worthless. They planted potatoes and the sand came up and covered them up, and they were never lifted. The land was worth so little that they abandoned it. It was worth nothing at all.

*MR. COCHRANE said in that case the hon. Member would certainly vote for the reduction of the salary of the right hon. Gentleman because the Congested Districts Board reporter reported that this land was a fine loam and suitable for growing potatoes. A still more subtle form of insinuation was indulged in by the Lord-Advocate. He attacked this lady directly and spoke of harsh landlordism, oppressed tenants, and of a landlord unfortunate in his relations with his tenants. The statement of the Secretary for Scotland of this lady attacked by his colleague was that he was well aware that she was genuinely and deeply concerned for the welfare of the people of the district. His conclusion upon the whole matter was that there had been a series of bungles and failures. There was the failure to purchase, the failure to compensate, the failure to enforce the law, and above all the failure of the Scottish Secretary to recognise the great responsibility of the duties which fall upon him. The result had been that ten or twelve of these misguided persons were in prison. Was this to go on indefinitely? When they came out were they to go back to Vatersay and finally to prison for a longer time? He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not be deterred by the bungling that had taken place from doing what the Committee thought would be a just thing for him to do. Let him carry out his own recommendations, purchase under arbitration, enter into possession of the land in dispute, and having got it settle these people upon it.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW) regretted that from the Leader of the Opposition they had had in the course of his speech the maximum of heat and the minimum of light on the situation. The right hon. Gentleman had attacked the Administration and had supported this reduction on grounds that he did not advocate in this House, but which he did advocate with some violence of language at Glasgow. This was his first and only opportunity of answering that speech; and he asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he now had reason to agree with or vary from those violent denunciations. The mover of the Amendment had charged him with not having adopted the Trespass Act of 1865. That was a matter in which he was personally concerned as the adviser of the Secretary for Scotland. That Act had not, except in one instance, during its whole existence, been attempted to be applied in circumstances like the present. He would state broadly that no lawyer of repute in Scotland who had ever written on the subject or spoken from the judicial bench had treated that Act as applicable to the present circumstances. The Act did not apply to a case of disputed possession which involved a question of heritable right. The Act was dealt with by Professor Rankine. It was passed for the purpose of preventing strolling tinkers, gipsies and others, squatting without permission. Accordingly, the law stepped in to give a short and effective remedy for cases of temporary nuisance; but this little Act of Parliament in 1865 did not upset the entire law of Scotland, and he was bound, in advising His Majesty's Government and his right hon. friend, to deal with the law of Scotland as it was found by legal authority. The Lord Justice Clerk (Moncreiff) who long held the high office he now filled, knew the whole question of social disorder well; and, in the case of Her Majesty's Advocate *v.* Macrae and others, on the Bench laid it down that—

> "Trespass constitutes in the general case a civil wrong and not a criminal act; and the proprietor's remedy is by civil writ or action for damages."

Accordingly, if he had ventured to upset the law of the land as laid down by high authorities in order to suit the convenience of any individual landowner in the whole of broad Scotland, he could imagine no one who would have been more eloquent than the Leader of the Opposition in charging him with having violated the law and order and sound precedent and with having exercised the law in an oppressive and tyrannical manner. They knew that he would have laid it on in language of that kind. Having dealt with the greatest lawyer on landownership in Scotland and the greatest Lord-Advocate so far as term of office and knowledge of social conditions were concerned, he had next to find what the greatest master of the Criminal Law in Scotland now living, the present Lord Justice Clerk, had said in a case similar to this on the floor of the House—

> "What," he said, "is the necessary consequence? The necessary consequence is that every man must defend his own property, or we must turn every person who can be sworn to be a trespasser into a criminal. The law in this free country says 'no' to that."

He was treated as an abettor of disorder because he declined to say "yes" to that to which his distinguished predecessor declared the answer to be "no." He asked what the position of the Lord-Advocate was in reference to the holder of the office of the Secretary for Scotland. The Leader of the Opposition was Secretary for Scotland when the last pronouncement was made in the House of Commons, and he was confronted, as his right hon. friend was now confronted with a disturbance of this kind. Did he talk of the Trespass Act and enter into all this pettifogging argument about it? Not at all. He rose and said that all the whole law and gospel—he was paraphrasing in a Scottish way—on the subject had been declared by Lord Advocate Macdonald in the passage he had just read to the Committee. He thought the right hon. Gentleman, when he charged the Government through his right hon. friend and himself, with aiding and abetting disorder might, notwithstanding his wonderful fund of oblivion, have recited his own approval of the law as laid down on a similar occasion. It was not a new situation. As Secretary for Scotland he had repeated troubles of this kind. There were a good many troubles in regard to Lady Gordon Cathcart's estate long ago, and the troubles had continued ever since. During the time the right hon. Gentleman was Leader of the Government various seizures of land took place in the Outer Hebrides, at Vatersay, Northbay and Goligarry (Barra), at Ormielate, Millin and Bornish (south-west), in North Uist and in Harris, and in none of these cases was the criminal law brought into play by him. The civil law was alone employed, and in every instance employed effectually. Looking back, therefore, he could say that had he violated the authorities as laid down, he would have been met with a further precedent and would have been advising the Secretary for Scotland to adopt the course which one of the most distinguished predecessors he could have had declined to adopt in similar circumstances. So far, therefore, from aiding and abetting the violation of the law, he had upheld the law and practice of the kingdom of Scotland. Of that action he had no repentance. There was a great body of authority for the advice he gave; there was authority approved in practice and in deed by the Leader of the Opposition himself. They now had to consider the situation of Lady Gordon Cathcart. He was sorry to say she had taken umbrage because he had said that her relations with her tenants were unfortunate. Could any human language have been more moderate in describing the situation? If they had not been unfortunate, why were they debating this question? This was not a single instance, it was the culmination of a long series of unfortunate relations between her and her tenants. She might be all right and they might be all wrong, but whoever was responsible, these relations were unfortunate, and that was what he had said. He had been asked what he meant by saying that he was sorry the right hon. Gentleman had removed the veil of secrecy from the transaction. He would tell the Committee. Lady Gordon Cathcart—and when he used that lady's name he meant her lawyers—through her agent demanded that the Government should put the criminal law into operation against her own people, contrary to the advice tendered to the Secretary for Scotland. The Papers showed that the lady was determined to have the Government proceed, not according to the advice of the law officers of the Crown, but according to her own lawyer's advice. And if the House would look on page 5 of that document they would see how that was borne out. He knew quite well that when this veil was removed there would be a good deal of disturbance, and that was the reason he did not wish it removed. This was the request made by these lawyers—

> "In our letter to you of the 14th March, 1906, in which we requested the Government to take action under the Trespass Act to put down the lawless movement then in its beginning, we pointed out that civil process was ineffective, difficult and expensive, while proceedings at the instance of the criminal authority could be easily taken."

He was surprised that any Member of the House holding any sense of responsibility should sanction for a moment the suggestion by one subject of the Crown that others should be treated as criminals, contrary to advice tendered to the Crown and in accordance with the advice given by his own lawyers in order to save expense and trouble. That was what actually happened. He need not point to the futility of the Trespass Act in such a situation. If they fined them over and over again the question would have been exactly where it was and it would afford no settlement on general lines. The gravamen of the complaint was not altogether the Trespass Act, but they wanted prompt and effective and strong action. Did the Committee realise what that meant? Did it mean a gunboat? Hon. Gentlemen opposite were silent about that. Did it mean the importation of troops? All these things were possible, but what they had done had been far more effective. They had referred the proprietress to the civil remedy. She had taken it, and now, at this moment, ten men were in prison for two months in consequence.

MR. YOUNGER: That is surely worse than the other remedy.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: They get sixty days instead of fourteen.

*MR. THOMAS SHAW said that his hon. friend did not seem to understand that the other course would not have been effective because it would have settled nothing, whereas now they had the judgment of the Supreme Court. Let the Committee picture the situation. Year after year these people had made an appeal to their landlord for more land. There were nearly 2,500 people in Barra, while on Vatersay, across the sound, with nearly 3,000 acres of land, there were only thirteen people. For a matter of a quarter of a century their demand had continued. The parish council on its election took a large share in endeavouring to put into effect the Allotments Act of 1892. They appealed to the county council of Inverness. The county council sent down a commission which was nine days on the spot, and unanimously reported in favour of land being granted, there being, according to the verdict of that commission, land available. From that moment till now eleven years had elapsed, and the county council had done nothing, and these people had been left, driven almost to desperation by the action or inaction of the county council.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that no land has been given out for small holdings in the last thirteen years?

*MR. THOMAS SHAW said he had said nothing of the sort. He said that these people wanted land in the Island of Vatersay, that the county counci and parish council and the sheriff all thought they ought to have it; the landlord thought they should not, they had not received it to this day, and they would not receive it until there was legislative power to impose compulsion. He protested against the assertion that they had done anything in any way to impair law and order. He asked the House, was he right to decline the request that he should have the criminal law put into operation? Was he right to decline to give advice that a gunboat or the military should be sent? Was he right to refer the proprietress to her civil remedies? Lady Gordon Cathcart had after all taken his advice. She had brought her interdict and her petition for breach of interdict, and she could not have moved a step in that direction without his consent as Lord Advocate. She had appealed for his consent, and in five minutes she had got it, and he stood thus absolved. And, therefore, he had assisted in the operation which alone was the legal operation. When that was done and the petition was lodged in Court on January 15th, on January 17th the right hon. Gentleman used this language in regard to a case pending before the Court. The right hon. Gentleman, he would take it, did not know it, but it was a fact. The petition was raised on the 15th January, service was made on the 16th January, and the right hon. Gentleman's speech was delivered on the 17th January. ["No."] It would not do to deny a fact.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It really was not a case pending in the ordinary sense. There was no question of fact before a

Court in regard to which anything which either I or anybody else could say could pervert justice. ["Oh!"]

*MR. THOMAS SHAW said according to that it came to be an argument as to what was the kind of question before the Court. That was not the point. The point was that there was a question; the case in short was *sub judice*. It was with regard to people accused that the language was used that they had committed a gross outrage, that they had not the least "legal or moral justification," and he said that that was language which Courts of the realm might have had to take very serious notice of. He had been reproached by the Member for the Newton division that he did not advise a remission of the sentence. But this case was a curious case, in that the sentence had been pronounced by the Court in a matter of contempt, and one could not, according to precedent, interpose in that matter. It would be most irregular for the Executive to interfere with the traditional functions of Judges in that way. And if even the right hon. Gentleman's conduct in prejudicially commenting on a case *sub judice* had been called in question, and something had happened to him in consequence—with the best will in the world he could not have interposed. Administratively the Government had held law and order absolutely sacred. With regard to the legal position, he signed a petition and did everything that was necessary, and he had advised in that sense. As his conduct had been challenged, it was only right to say that, so far back as March, 1906, very shortly after he assumed office, a resolution was sent to him from a meeting of the crofters of Iachdar district accompanied by reports of the language used at the meeting suggestive of possible violation of the law, and he thought it right to say that he wrote a letter in which he tendered his advice with all who had influence with the people in the district "that they should confine themselves to the assertion and agitation of their demands, but in no respect whatever attempt to take the law into their own hands or do anything which might either cause or provoke a breach of public order." It was in those circumstances and with that record that the right hon. Gentleman said that the Government had encouraged these people to break the law. It was too bad; and he asked the House to support him in that. The accusation was wholly unfounded and there was not the slightest ground for the assertion—and he hoped in his term of office there never would be—that he had in any respect countenanced a breach of the law or of order in this country. They had in a difficult time been called upon to hold evenly the scales of justice, and he contended they had done it with absolute impartiality. He did not much care to refer to the time-worn argument of law and order in such circumstances. Those who attempted to defend an autocracy of this nature, had they not a great responsibility for their words? Then with regard to the present proprietress, he was quite certain that if she went to this estate, even for one hour, and saw these people her policy would change, and change at once. But if these people were in their present position from not obeying the law, it was his duty to see that the law was maintained, and maintained impartially. He did not wish to say one single hard word, but in the three minutes, which was all the time that remained to him, he would remind this landed proprietress that the further imprisonment of these men lay not with him, not even with the Court, but with her alone. If she wished for modification of their imprisonment, and expressed her wish that the imprisonment of these men should no longer be continued, the men would at once be liberated according to practice. He hoped she would take that step. He hoped that another thing would be done, that on both sides of this dispute there would be a desire to come to some arrangement under which these properties could be developed under conditions which both sides would recognise as equitable. The recent negotiations had yielded nothing except the demand that the entire island—in fact, three islands of the Hebrides—should be bought from her and broken up before she would allow any of these people the chance of being planted upon their plots of land. He hoped that Lady Cathcart would incline towards peace. The Government had sustained the law. That peace and order might prevail—that was his desire, but it would never have prevailed if he had violated those great precedents to which he had referred or if he had sanctioned a course absolutely unjustified by the history of our Courts.

Mr. WEIR asked if he was right in assuming that there was a motion before the Committee to reduce the whole Vote. —[Cries of "Divide, divide."] There were various other matters——

Mr. EUGENE WASON rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, "That a sum not exceeding £10,600 be granted for the said service."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 52; Noes, 175. (Division List No. 138.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Helmsley, Viscount
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Magnus, Sir Philip
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill,Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Smmerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone ,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.G eo.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cremer, Sir William Randal

Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(Montgomery Co)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H.(St.Pancras,N
Dillon, John
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn SirW.Brampton
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen,W.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt.Hn A C.(Kincard)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk,E)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Rainy, A. Rolland
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thompson, J W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wason,RtHn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Original Question again proposed.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

NATIONAL MILITARY TRAINING BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [Lords], POST OFFICE (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [Lords], AND STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [Lords].

Ordered, that so much of the Lords Message [18th June] as relates to the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords], Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords], and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords], be now considered.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Lords' Message considered accordingly.

Ordered, that a Select Committee of seven Members be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords, as mentioned in their Lordships' Message of 18th June, to consider the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords], Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords], and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords].

Committee accordingly nominated of—Mr. Beale, Mr. Cave, Mr. Arnold Herbert, Mr. Hills, Mr. Kavanagh, Mr. Solicitor-General, and Mr. Stewart-Smith.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.

Ordered, "That a Message be sent to the Lords to acquaint them therewith, and to request that their Lordships will be pleased to add two Lords to the said Joint Committee."—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

SCOTTISH ESTIMATES.

On the Motion for adjournment,

MR. PIRIE asked whether, in view of the ruling of the Chairman of Ways and Means, which had precluded discussion of several Scottish subjects on the Vote for the salary of the Secretary for Scotland, the Patronage Secretary would make representations to the Prime Minister with the view of giving another day for the discussion of Scottish Supply. Not a word of discussion had taken place upon the administration of the ten boards that came under the Scottish Office, and he hoped another day would be given.

MR. WILLIAMSON (Elgin and Nairn) strongly supported this request in view of the importance of the subject to be discussed on the Fishery Board Vote. It would be lamentable if no further opportunity was given to discuss other important subjects.

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars) said he desired to raise the question of the unemployed in Glasgow who he thought had a substantial grievance against the Scottish Office and the Local Government Board. He hoped the Government would give them an opportunity of discussing these very important matters.

MR. MORTON said that no opportunity had yet been given them to discuss the question of the trawlers, and he hoped another day would be given.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) complained that the Report of the Scottish Local Government Board had only been issued that morning, and that it appeared to Scottish Members as if there was a deliberate intention on the part of the Scottish Office to deprive the Scottish Members of opportunities for discussion. That was not fair, and if it happened again next year, he would look upon it as an attempt on the part of the Scottish Office to prevent the Committee exercising that control which it had a right to exercise.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. J. A. PEASE, Essex, Saffron Walden) said he would be very glad to convey the views of hon. Members to the Prime Minister, and whilst it must be obvious to the House he could not promise at that moment either a whole or even half a day, yet in the event of a general desire being expressed that further time should be afforded for the discussion of Scottish Estimates he had no doubt it would be favourably considered by the Prime Minister.

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 26*th June*, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Audenshaw Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Blackburn Corporation Bill; London United Tramways Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill; Marriages Provisional Order Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

PETITIONS.

CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Harrogate; and Medwyn; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against: From Middlesbrough (two); and, Shipowners of the City of London; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Thurso, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Cirencester, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Harrogate, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Clackmannan, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Petition of Free Watermen, etc., of the river Thames, against, praying to be heard by counsel; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS BILL.

Petition from St. Pancras, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATIONAL GUARANTEE FOR THE WAR RISKS OF SHIPPING.

Copy presented, of Report to the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury of the Committee appointed to consider a National Guarantee for the War Risks of Shipping; with Minutes of Evidence and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (CHANGES IN WAGES, ETC.).

Copies ordered, "of the Post Office Circulars announcing changes in the wages and conditions of service of Post Office Servants in connection with the Report of the Select Committee on Post Office Servants."—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Proceedings under the Land Purchase Acts.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what is the result of the proceedings under the Land Purchase Acts of 1885 and 1888; how much land has been sold, or agreed to be sold, under these Acts, and how much money has been actually advanced; what is the general result of proceedings under the Land Purchase Acts of 1881 and 1896; what is the amount actually issued under these Acts, or agreed to be issued under the Acts; what is the general result of the proceedings under the Land Purchase Act of 1903; what sum has actually been issued or advanced; what is the total amount of agreements lodged under all headings for the purchase of land under this Act; how much money have the Land Commission actually in hand at present; what is the total value of the estates still to be dealt with by the

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Land Commission in respect of which advances have not been issued or sanctioned; and how much sinking fund has been actually paid up under all the Land Purchase Acts, and what has been done with it.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Full particulars respecting proceedings under the Land Purchase Acts of 1885, 1888, 1891, and 1896, have appeared from time to time in Parliamentary Returns and in the annual Reports of the Irish Land Commission and the Appendices thereto. I would refer the hon. Member in particular to pages 92 and 107 and page 116 of the Report of the Irish Land Commission for the year ending 31st March, 1907 (Cd. 3652, Session 1907) and to House of Commons Return, No. 90, of Session 1903. As regards proceedings under the Irish Land Act of 1903, the Land Commission inform me that up to the 20th instant applications for advances had been received by, or proceedings instituted before, the Estates Commissioners for the purchase of estates to the estimated amount of £63,598,394. Of this sum £21,940,988 had been advanced, leaving £41,657,406, representing the estimated amount of advances in respect of which proceedings are still pending before the Commissioners. The Irish Land Purchase Fund, from which all moneys are issued for the purposes of advances under the Irish Land Act, 1903, and to which all moneys received from land purchase annuitants are paid, is under the control of the National Debt Commissioners, who provide the money for advances when required by the Estates Commissioners.

Pension of late Rector of Girls' High School, Glasgow.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary for Scotland what was the amount of pension granted to the rector of the Girls' High School, Glasgow, on his retiral in October, 1905; what was the length of service he had given to the board; and what is the salary now paid to his successor.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Department are informed by the Glasgow School Board that the amount of retiring allowance granted to the rector of the Glasgow High School for Girls was £325 per annum. He entered the Board's service in July, 1875, his length of service thus being 30½ years. The salary of his successor, a lady, commenced at £400 per annum and is now £500 per annum.

Cadets at Dartmouth, Osborne, and on Cruisers.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can state the number of cadets at Dartmouth and Osborne respectively, the number of cadets in the training cruisers, and the complements of officers, instructors, warrant officers, and petty officers cf the training cruisers.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The numbers asked for are as follows:—

Cadets at Osborne College -	391
Cadets at Dartmouth College -	385
Cadets in two training cruisers	122

The numbers allowed to each cruiser are as follows:—

Officers (excluding naval instructors) - - - -	19
Naval instructors - - -	3
Warrant officers - - - -	7
Chief petty officers - -	29
Petty officers - - - -	50
Petty officers, second class, and leading rates - - -	56

Irish Education Grants.

MR. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state whether the condition excluding schools under an average of 35 from participation in the additional grant of £114,000 for primary education in Ireland was imposed by the Treasury against the wishes of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland; whether the Commissioners of National Education protested very strongly against the exclusion; and whether, having regard to the hardship of the condition on the poorest section of primary teachers, the Treasury would be prepared to reconsider their decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The condition in question was not suggested by the Commissioners of National Education, and the Commissioners have, I understand, protested against it. I am, however, of opinion, after fully considering the question, that the limitation is a proper one in the circumstances, and I see no sufficient reason for reopening the decision.

Introduction of the Agricultural Holdings and Small Holdings Consolidation Bills.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, when the Agricultural Holding Acts Consolidation Bill and the Small Holdings Acts Consolidation Bill will be introduced in the House of Commons.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) As soon as possible.

Result of Labourers Act Inquiry at Dunfanaghy.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if the inquiry held on the 16th instant at Dunfanaghy, county Donegal, to consider applications for labourers' cottages and allotments in the Creelough Division of the Dunfanaghy Union has resulted in showing that there is no necessity for such cottages; and, if not, can he say what the result of the inquiry has been.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board's inspector has not yet arrived at his decision respecting the several applications which came before him at the inquiry, as he must await the transcript of the shorthand notes of the evidence. The result of the inquiry will be communicated to the rural district council in due course.

Transfer of Officers of Disbanded Units.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the intention of the Army Council to bring officers from disbanded units into regiments in the Special Reserve, with seniority according to the dates of their commissions; and whether such action will have the effect of placing them, in many instances, over the heads of existing officers in the regiments to which they are appointed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is the intention that officers of disbanded Militia units joining units of the Special Reserve shall take rank in accordance with the date of their appointment to the rank they held at the date of transfer. In the case of an officer electing to join a battalion of a regiment other than his own in which there is no vacancy for an officer of his rank, he may, if the commanding officer be unwilling that he should rank in accordance with the date of his appointment to the rank he holds at the date of transfer, be transferred in the rank he holds, his appointment to that rank bearing the date of transfer to the new corps. The reply to the second part of the Question is therefore in the affirmative.

TOBACCO GROWING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Not amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said he rose to move the omission of Clause 1, which was to a great extent the whole Bill, but not entirely, because Clause 2 had a separate object to which he could see no objection whatever. The result of leaving out this clause would be that there would be power for the Inland Revenue to allow people to grow tobacco experimentally. He could not find that there was any great desire among his Scottish friends to have the Bill, or among Scottish agriculturists to grow tobacco, and he thought the Government took that view also. At any rate if it was necessary that Clause 1 should pass, which gave power to grow tobacco, he wanted to know why it was not to be introduced all over Great Britain. A Bill had been passed for Ireland, but he did not think this kind of piecemeal legislation was advisable, and if it was necessary that tobacco should be grown, there should be a Bill brought in by the responsible authority applying to the whole country. As far as experiment went he had no objection, but he did not see why Scotland alone should be taken and permission given to grow tobacco and alter the Customs. Clause 1 did not make it obligatory on the Commissioners of Inland Revenue to levy an Excise duty, and he intended to move later to make it obligatory. Scotland was now the home and refuge of certain kinds of statesmen, and if many more of them had to go to Scotland, which was extremely likely, he feared that if the clause passed, pressure must be put on them to allow Scotland to grow tobacco free of duty, and that would be very hard on Ireland and the rest of the Kingdom. If the clause was omitted and it was afterwards found that tobacco could be grown profitably, a Bill dealing with England and Scotland could be introduced and the matter set at rest. He would like to know from the promoters what was the real reason for the introduction of the clause, whether there was any foundation for it, or whether it was merely that they were envious because Irish Members had an Act.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present. House counted; and, forty Members being found present—

SIR F. BANBURY proceeded. The clause read—

> "As from a date to be fixed by His Majesty by Order in Council, and as soon as Parliament has made provisions for an Excise duty on tobacco,"

certain things should ensue. Supposing an Order in Council was not made and Parliament did not make provision, the clause would be useless, and if, as he was informed, the Government were hostile to the measure there was no chance whatever, though it might pass into law, of its becoming of any use. Therefore that was another strong argument for the omission of Clause 1. He believed it was now something like 130 years since tobacco was grown in Scotland, and there was not very much experience, and it was doubtful whether in the changed conditions of agriculture it had any chance of being a success now.

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, South,) seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

> "In page 1, line 11, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'shall,' in page 1, line 17, stand part of the Bill."

*MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said he could not support his hon. friend on this occasion. He would like to ascertain if he could what was the attitude of the Government. In Committee the then Secretary to the Treasury had endeavoured to squash this innocent Bill, which was really designed to do some good for Scotland and remove a grievance from which they suffered, but the arguments used by the right hon. Gentleman certainly did not carry weight with the Committee, because it handsomely defeated the Government. The Secretary to the Treasury adduced as an argument that the hon. Member for Clare had brought down to the House some Irish tobacco with disastrous results. But it was not necessary for hon. Members to smoke the Scottish tobacco when it was grown; there was nothing compulsory in the Bill, and tobacco might be beneficially used for other purposes than smoking. The growth of tobacco was prohibited in England in 1672 by heavy penalties. Then came the Act of Union in 1707 which it was generally considered incorporated the law of England with that of Scotland. But they held a different opinion in Scotland, and they did not believe the Act of Union imposed upon them these stringent laws regarding the penalties for growing tobacco in Scotland and for many years they continued to grow it with very considerable success until, he supposed, the inroads upon the revenue induced the Government in 1782 to pass an Act which imposed the same penalties in Scotland as were imposed in England. That was a great hardship upon Scotland. Very good tobacco had been grown, and it employed an enormous amount of labour per acre. In the experimental stages in Ireland as many as 100 men were employed per ten acres. In some parts of Scotland they could grow tobacco quite as well as in parts of Ireland, and where they were clamouring for employment of the population, it was extremely hard that they should be deprived of an opportunity of cultivating tobacco. It became necessary for the Legislature the year after passing the Act of 1782 to pass another Act to compensate those farmers who had been growing tobacco for the losses which they had sustained through prohibition. The Act of 1783 enacted—

> "That it shall and may be lawful to and for the Commissioners of His Majesty's Customs at Edinburgh, or any three or more of them, to allow and order to be paid to the owner or proprietor of such tobacco, out of any revenue under their management which is applicable to the payment of incidence, at the rate of 4d. for every pound weight of such tobacco to which the owner or proprietor thereof shall refuse to pay the full duties imposed by the said recited Act, provided that such tobacco shall be given up by him to the proper officer of His Majesty's Customs to be publicly burnt or otherwise totally destroyed by such officers."

It was most unfortunate that the previous occupant of the office of Secretary to the Treasury went to the Scottish Committee, and without having fully considered the matter, put the full weight of the Treasury against the passage of this Bill on what appeared to him very insufficient grounds. He said that had there been experiments already in Scotland, as there had been in Ireland, and had they proved to be successful, he would agree to the passage of such a Bill. He (Mr. Cochrane) thought he had not looked up the fact that growing tobacco in Scotland had passed the experimental stage, and had been practically and commercially tried, and proved a great success before these duties were imposed. The Secretary to the Treasury had endeavoured to make a most immoral bargain with the Committee. He said, "Do not pass this Bill, and the Treasury will give you permits to grow tobacco." He challenged the right of the Treasury to grant these permits to break the law. Under what statute had the Treasury power to grant permits? The hon. Gentleman was absolutely unable to furnish him with the information because he knew perfectly well that the Treasury had no statutory right to grant them. Similar permits had been granted in Ireland, but everybody familiar with the administration of the law in Ireland knew that the Irish were allowed to do things which the Scottish were not. The Scottish were essentially a law-abiding race, and instead of condoning these irregular methods on the part of the Government, they preferred to have the industry legalised by an Act of Parliament. Therefore some gratitude was due to the hon. Member for taking such an interest in the subject and introducing this Bill. In his opinion there was no reason why it should not be passed into law. He had risen to support the hon. Member. He hoped the Bill would be passed and that the occupants of the front bench would explain their attitude. Had they receded from the hostile attitude taken up in Grand Committee, and did they intend not only to give their blessing to the Bill, but after it had passed that it should be practically operative and not have placed any obstacle in the way of its success?

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said this was not a party matter, and he was very sorry the hon. Baronet was opposing the Bill. He was satisfied from his knowledge of the City of London that he would not be supported in not allowing the Scottish people to do what the Irish people were allowed to do. He had no objection to a Bill being passed for England and Wales as well as Scotland and Ireland, but it was more the hon. Baronet's business to introduce such a Bill than his. He specially represented Scotland on this occasion. They had all so far as he knew supported the Irish Bill which was carried without any objection. The Irish Bill was also passed unanimously by the House of Lords, and, therefore, on those grounds there ought to be no objection to this Bill for Scotland. Scottish Members were obliged to hon. Members opposite for the assistance they had given them so far in carrying this Bill. Tobacco had been successfully grown in Scotland. He had in his hand some tobacco and cigars which had been produced and grown in Scotland and both were as good quality as could be produced anywhere else. That was a substantial reason why they should at least give the farmers of Scotland an opportunity of developing this industry if they wished to. Tobacco required a great deal of labour to be bestowed in its cultivation; therefore, if they grew tobacco they would go a long way towards finding employment for the people of the country. Tobacco was grown in Scotland before. [Cries of "When?"] It was grown previous to 1782. There was no question that it could be grown in Scotland just as well as in Germany, Holland, Belgium, or any other country. It was true that in regard to tobacco-growing there might be a bad year occasionally, but that would occur in regard to any other kind of crop. This Bill was put forward with the express object of giving the people of Scotland an opportunity of growing tobacco for the benefit of the trade of the country generally. No harm could possibly be done by the passing of the Bill, because those who did not wish to take advantage of its provisions need not do so. So far as he knew the Government did not intend to oppose it. The restrictions in the Bill were those which the Government had insisted on in the case of the Irish Bill. It was no doubt the duty of the Government to look after the revenue, and they had only done what they thought was right to protect the revenue. He hoped the hon Baronet the Member for the City of London would withdraw his Amendment and allow the people of Scotland to have the benefit of this Bill. He trusted the House would carry the Bill unanimously as was done last year in the case of the Irish Bill.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs) said he was in favour of the Bill, and hoped the hon. Baronet for the City of London would withdraw his Amendment. On the previous day they were discussing the troubles of the West of Scotland, and it was the duty of every citizen to try to find some industry for those far-off highlands and islands, because the trouble in the West of Scotland would disappear if the inhabitants could be furnished with an industry like tobacco-growing. He had relations who had tried tobacco-growing in Ireland, and he knew that it was going to pay there. He did not see why it should not be equally a success in the West of Scotland. It would encourage additional means of transport and in many ways be a great help to the people.

*SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) said there were many good reasons why the Amendment should be withdrawn and the Bill passed. At the time of the American War, when the supplies of tobacco from abroad were cut off, the farmers of Scotland grew tobacco, especially round Kelso and Jedburgh. In 1798 at the instance of Sir John Sinclair a history of agriculture in the county of Roxburgh was published by the Rev. Robert Douglas, D.D., minister of Galashiels. He stated that in Crailing parish a farmer grew tobacco on 13 acres; but as the Act of 1792 came into operation he had to sell the crop to the Excise at 4d. a pound, so he got £104, or £8 an acre. The Statistical Account of 1841 showed that he had sold it on the ground for £320; but he was obliged to hand it over for only the £104. The general loss caused by the Act to Roxburghshire farmers came up to £1,500. But later experiments in parts of Norfolk and Kent and Ireland had shown that there were numbers of places where tobacco could be profitably grown. Tobacco was just the kind of crop to be grown by people who had only a small area or small holding to cultivate. He hoped the House would accede to the reasonable and natural demands of the people of Scotland in this matter. In counties like Roxburghshire it would do something to stop the depopulation, and it would benefit the revenue. It would give farmers an opportunity of varying their crops, and it would give employment to more people. The industry of small holders would be benefited, and generally it would help localities which were largely interested in the development of agriculture. Before the Act was passed prohibiting the growing of tobacco in England capitalists in London and elsewhere complained of the injury done to the Colonial trade by the cultivation of tobacco here, and they wished to encourage the growing of tobacco in Virginia which was a purely English Colony. He hoped the hon. Baronet would not press the Amendment.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) said that when he came to the House he thought it would be a good thing if this Bill did not pass into law, but since he had listened to several admirable speeches from the representatives of Scottish constituencies, and especially to that of the hon. Member for Roxburghshire he was convinced that the Bill will prove of benefit to Scotland, and, therefore, he joined in the appeal to the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London to withdraw his objection. So far as he could see, the passing of the Bill might mean the starting of a new industry in Scotland which would prove of benefit to small holders in that country. He hoped that the tobacco grown in Scotland would prove equal to that grown in Ireland and foreign countries. If Scotland and Ireland were to have the right to grow tobacco, he thought a Bill should be passed next year giving England the same privilege. He would like to hear from the hon. Member representing the Government whether they would be able to acquiesce in that suggestion, or whether it would be necessary for a private Member to bring forward a Bill on the subject.

*MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich) said he wished to support the suggestion of the hon. Member opposite. Personally, he should support this Bill just as he supported the Irish Bill last year, because he had never been able to appreciate the arguments used in favour of the prohibition of the growing of tobacco, or the production of any other kind of merchandise, in this country. He had smoked Irish tobacco and survived, and he had no doubt that Scottish tobacco would be found to be equally good. He was surprised at the opposition of the hon. Baronet, because at present the Treasury regulations really operated in the direction of protecting the foreign producer. The hon. Baronet was unquestionably a supporter of fair trade, and therefore he ought to support the Scottish Members in the passing of this Bill. His only right to intervene in the discussion was that he was the representative of an agricultural division. He sincerely hoped that his hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury would either promote a similar Bill for England, or allow some of his faithful followers to do so. If the hon. Baronet would bring in a Bill to allow tobacco growing in England, he would be very happy to support it.

*MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said it was difficult to understand why this Bill should not at once be extended to England. His hon. friend had suggested that this might be done next year. He did not see why Scotland, which had many advantages over England, should have the further advantage of being allowed to grow tobacco a year in advance of this country. One was at a loss to understand why the different parts of the United Kingdom should not be allowed to grow almost anything out of which a profit could be made. He supposed there would be a moral objection to the growing of the poppy for the production of opium. There were many people who regarded the use of tobacco as almost as pernicious as the use of opium, but that view, he was thankful to say, was not generally held by the people of this country. He objected to Scotland being given the power to grow tobacco while England was prevented from doing so. The hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London was averse to giving permission to grow tobacco. That might be because he feared that a Radical Government would prohibit the importation of Havana cigars, of which he was an appreciative consumer. He hoped that the hon. Baronet would withdraw the Amendment. At present every branch of agriculture was more or less in a depressed condition.

SIR F. BANBURY: No.

*MR. CARLILE said he remembered that the hon. Baronet, himself, and other agriculturists did pretty well last year. They were able to sell wheat at 38s. a quarter. There was, nevertheless, strong competition to contend against, and it seemed to be a pity that farmers should not be allowed to produce any kind of crops which would yield a profit. The Government had done little towards reducing unemployment in the country, and here they had an opportunity of promoting an industry which had long since passed the experimental stage, and which would increase employment. There should be no difficulty with regard to the Excise arrangements for the protection of the revenue in the different parts of the United Kingdom.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) expressed his satisfaction that the Bill had reached a stage which afforded strong hope of its becoming law this session. It was a measure which would do something to alleviate distress in the West Highlands of Scotland. He hoped the hon. Baronet would withdraw his opposition and allow the Bill to pass.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) appealed to his hon. friend not to press his Amendment. They were all agreed in committee that while it might not be of great advantage to Scotland as a whole, there was one particular district where tobacco might be grown with success. Personally, he had little hope that the product in Scotland would be of a very high quality, and he would be sorry himself to smoke it. [HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!] He had had experience in endeavouring to smoke Welsh tobacco, where the conditions were likely to be more satisfactory for growing the plant than in any part of Scotland, and any gentleman who could smoke that tobacco must have a pretty strong throat, and be able to stand a good deal. At the same time there was no reason why the experiments of tobacco-growing in Scotland, which had been conducted on a considerable scale, should not be proceeded with, and he hoped the hon. Baronet would therefore withdraw his Amendment.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.) said he accepted the invitation of the hon. Member below the gangway, but he promised to detain the House for only a moment. He understood that there were a large number of Scottish representatives in the House who were very anxious that tobacco should be cultivated in Scotland, not, as he gathered from their speeches, that they might smoke it themselves, but rather that they might offer it to their friends. It would be very ungracious on the part of the Government to stand in the way of any benevolent intentions of that kind, and he, therefore, on behalf of the Government, accepted the Bill.

MR. CARLILE: What about England?

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he had no objection to this Bill except as regarded the limitation of the title. So far as he understood, the Secretary to the Treasury had given sympathetic expression to its extension to Scotland. He confessed he was not familiar with the experiments in tobacco growing which had been carried on in Scotland, and he questioned if they were likely to be as successful as those which had been made in Ireland. Indeed, he was quite sure that East Anglia and Lincolnshire were more suitable for tobacco growing than many portions of Ireland, and he would have wished that the hon. Gentleman's predecessor had treated with less hostility the idea of making the experiment of the cultivation of tobacco in England.

*MR. MORTON said that the supporters of this Bill had not said a word against the idea of bringing in a Bill to apply to England and Wales.

LORD BALCARRES said he understood that the Treasury was hostile to a measure for England.

SIR F. BANBURY said that as it appeared that there were a considerable number of Members for Scotland who were desirous of having the Bill passed he would be glad to withdraw his Amendment. His point was similar to that of the hon. Member for Hertfordshire that the Bill only applied to Scotland, and it would be out of order to move that it should be extended to England. His object had been to ascertain whether there was a real desire on the part of Scottish Members to have this Bill, and it also occurred to him that if it was good for Scotland it would be good also for England. His hon. friend made a speech in Committee to extend the Bill to England, but his proposal was rejected at the instigation of the Treasury. He congratulated the Government on their change of front, and he hoped that next year the provisions of the Bill would be extended to England. He begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR F. BANBURY hoped the Government would accept the Amendment standing in his name to leave out in the first Clause, line 19, the word "may" for the purpose of inserting "shall." This part of the Clause referred to the Board of Inland Revenue fixing the excise duty. The Inland Revenue ought not to be deprived of any excise duty as the result of the passage of this Bill, and if the Board exempted Scotland from taxation, as it might if "may" was retained, that might operate very hardly on the rest of the United Kingdom. His hon. friend might say that "may" in law meant "shall," but "shall" was a plain old-English word which was understanded of everybody.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 19, to leave out the word 'may,' and insert the word 'shall,'"—(*Sir F. Banbury*),—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'may' stand part of the Bill."

*MR. MORTON said he did not himself object to the alteration, but he was bound in good faith to stand by the Bill as agreed to in Committee. The word "may" was insisted upon by the Government in the Irish Bill last year, and he had no doubt that the Government would insist on the same condition for Scotland as they did for Ireland. They could not ask any more.

*MR. CARLILE opposed the Amendment. It was not necessary to strengthen the Bill by the substitution of "shall" for "may." "May" was quite strong enough. The Inland Revenue would not be loth to put their powers into force. What he wanted was to put the position of the agriculturist in as favourable a light as possible, and they could leave the Treasury to look after itself.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third, time and passed.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (ADMISSION OF THE PRESS) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

MR. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs) moved a new clause (Application to Scotland). He said that in the Standing Committee the hon. Member for South Aberdeen proposed that the Bill should apply to Scotland, and that was unanimously agreed to; but it was found impossible there and then to frame words, which were very complicated in detail, applying the Bill to Scotland. The new clause had now been drafted, and as he understood the Scottish Office had approved of it, he hoped the House would accept it. He begged to move.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College) seconded the new clause. He hoped that no objection would be raised to the application of the Bill to Scotland. What was good enough for England was good enough for Scotland.

New clause—

"In the application of this Act to Scotland —(1) the expression 'local authority' means— (a) a county council, a town council, a parish council, a school board, and a district committee constituted under the Local Government (Scotland) Acts; (b) a central body and a distress committee under the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905; (c) a joint committee or joint board or any other body constituted under the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, the Poor Law (Scotland) Act, 1845, and any Act amending the same, the Lunacy (Scotland) Acts, 1856 to 1900, or any other Act of Parliament or Provisional Order, and administering or entitled to administer funds derived from any rate; (2) the expression 'Local Government Board' means the Local Government Board for Scotland; (3) the definition of the expression 'local authority,' in Section 2 of this Act, shall not apply to Scotland,"—(*Mr. Gulland,*)—

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. CARLILE opposed the clause on the ground that he did not wish the measure to be introduced into Scotland, because he did not wish to see the Bill brought in for England.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was not entitled to discuss that as the principle of the Bill had already been agreed to, and this Amendment was merely to explain the powers of the Bill in Scotland.

MR. CARLILE contended that it was not necessary to extend the powers of this Bill to Scotland, and its only effect would be largely to increase Scottish oratory in all sub-committees of local authorities in that country. The House had an illustration on the previous day of how a comparatively small group of hon. Members representing Scottish constituencies could occupy the whole of a sitting in discussing a small matter, and the Bill would result in the amount of verbosity and eloquence being increased tenfold. Everybody familiar with local bodies in Scotland knew that very often where the Press was present there was the maximum of oratory and the minimum of work.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was not discussing this clause at all, but the Bill at large. The Bill applied to Scotland already and this was the interpretation clause.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause added to the Bill.

SIR F. BANBURY moved to insert at the end of line 7, in Clause 1, the words "as often as may be desirable at any meeting." It might be that at the beginning of a meeting there was no business which in the opinion of the council or committee it was best to keep private, but something might happen subsequently in regard to which it might be thought that the Press ought to be excluded from the discussion. The meeting might have forgotten to move the resolution, and when the second order came on it might be held that it was impossible to exclude the Press because the motion had not been made before the first order was discussed. Probably the hon. Member in charge of the Bill would accept the Amendment which it was quite clear only carried out the intention of the Bill. He desired only to make perfectly clear what was intended so that the Press and the local authority might work amicably together.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 7, to insert the words 'as often as may be desirable at any meeting.'"—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) hoped the hon. Member would not press the Amendment. In his opinion it was altogether unnecessary. Local authorities already had the power of exclusion, and he objected to the words of the Amendment because they would form a standing invitation to local authorities to exclude the representatives of the Press from their meetings. The object of the measure was to guard the rights of the public by enabling the fullest information to be obtained for them in regard to the actions of their representatives upon local authorities.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. MASTERMAN) West Ham, N.) said the Government thought the Amendment useful. In its present form the Bill seemed to imply that once the representatives of the Press were excluded they would be excluded during the whole of the time that a particular meeting lasted. Therefore the Government had no objection to this Amendment, which he thought might be accepted by the hon. Member.

MR. YOUNGER suggested that the point was met by the use of the word "temporarily" in the clause.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON inclined to the opinion that the suggestion of the hon. Member who had just sat down to insert the word "temporarily" would cover the whole point raised by the hon. Member opposite.

MR. CARLILE said he did not think the word "temporarily" would be sufficient to meet the case, nor did he think it would have the same effect as the words of the Amendment, which suggested that the Press might be excluded at various short intervals during the one sitting.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON did not think it mattered very much, and was inclined to accept the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. GUINNESS (Bury St. Edmunds) proposed to omit "two-thirds" and insert "a majority," in order that a bare majority of the members of a local authority might be able to pass a resolution excluding the representatives of the Press from a meeting when such exclusion was advisable in the public interest in view of the special nature of the business to be dealt with. In the case of the London County Council there was a standing order that the public and the Press should be admitted, and that standing order could be changed by the will of a bare majority. If the vote of a majority of two-thirds of the members of an authority were insisted upon, party feeling might induce a minority not representing the view of a majority of the ratepayers, to vote against the exclusion of the Press, and in that way to defeat the public interest and the views of the majority of the council. He thought private sittings of a local authority when exercising judicial functions were desirable. The manner in which a county council acting as the licensing authority for music-halls carried on its work at present was almost a scandal, for after evidence had been heard party speeches were made and party recriminations indulged in, and in such a case as that it was highly desirable that the Press should not be admitted.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the words 'two-thirds,' and to insert the words 'a majority.'"—(*Mr. Guinness.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two-thirds' stand part of the Bill."

MR. GODFREY BARING (Isle of Wight), in supporting the Amendment, said it was almost essential that discussions as to the purchase of property by local authorities should not be carried on in the presence of representatives of the Press; but if only a small majority of the members of an authority were in favour of a particular purchase, the Press could not be excluded under the Bill in its present form.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON considered there was a great deal of force in the arguments with which the Amendment had been supported, and expressed willingness to accept it.

Amendment agreed to.

SIR F. BANBURY moved to insert the following proviso: "Provided also that it shall be lawful for such local authority to determine by a like majority that any matters discussed thereat shall not be published, and to provide by standing order, regulation, or otherwise, as may be approved by the Local Government Board, that any infringement of such resolution may be punished by exclusion of the person offending from future proceedings of the local authority for a period not exceeding three months." It might well be that there was a rather delicate matter under discussion, but that the local authority did not think it was desirable to exclude the Press. Some dispute might arise between members of local authorities and some unseemly discussion take place, and he did not think anything was to be gained by washing dirty linen in public. He therefore thought there should be power given to the local authority to point out that that particular matter should not be published. He thought the Amendment really was in the interests of everybody, although he admitted it was not of very great importance. They knew very well that the fifth-rate Press was inclined to take to small personal matters and publish them, and he did not think any hon. Member wanted that to be done.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 14, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided also that it shall be lawful for such local authority to determine by a like majority that any matters discussed thereat shall not be published, and to provide by Standing Order, regulation, or otherwise, as may be approved by the Local Government Board, that any infringement of such resolution may be punished by exclusion of the person offending from future proceedings of the local authority for a period not exceeding three months.'"—(*Sir F Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he did not think the Amendment would do as it stood, because it did not take account of the Amendment last put in. But apart from that it would be unreasonable to put it in, because there was no advantage in the representatives of the Press being present at all unless they published the proceedings.

SIR F. BANBURY said there was another point. Supposing the representatives of the Press had been excluded and individual members of the authority published what took place, he thought that ought to be prevented, and his Amendment, he took it, would provide for that. What was the good of excluding the Press if they left the power with any single member of the local authority to publish the proceedings? He was naturally desirous of giving every consideration to the opinion of his noble friend, but he thought he had overlooked that point.

LORD R. CECIL said that if that was the meaning of the Amendment he thought it was quite out of order, because it would be an attempt, not to regulate the presence of representatives of the Press at meetings of local authorities, but to regulate the rights of members of local authorities themselves.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) thought the Amendment was in order, the object of it being to prevent representatives of the Press, when they had been excluded by a majority of the local authority, from publishing what occurred in their absence by getting their information from members or by other means.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON said he was rather disposed against the Amendment before it was moved, but since it had been moved and explained he must say, on behalf of the promoters, that they were most strenuously opposed to it. They had no right in their Bill to curtail the rights and privileges of members of the various local authorities, and on that account he hoped the House would negative the Amendment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. EMMOTT, Oldham): I do not think the words are really out of order.

MR. GUINNESS hoped the House would accept the Amendment, because it appeared to him that it was impossible for any local authority to know what would be brought out in a debate beforehand, and confidential documents might be quoted by members of the council which, in the public interest, should not be published in the Press. Only the other day, on the London County Council, an extremely confidential document was sent to a certain paper and published, against the interests of the Council. If the Amendment was not accepted they would have no redress in a case of that sort. He thought they could not expect the Press to respect the confidence of these councils unless they could be punished in some way if they neglected to do so.

SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said that if every document submitted to a local authority must be published, were they quite sure that that authority would be supplied with information of a confidential character? It was sometimes not agreeable to tell the whole truth, and it might incur an amount of unpopularity. He had had some experience of these matters, and he knew the great difficulty there was to obtain a full disclosure of the facts which it was necessary to consider before they could arrive at a proper conclusion.

MR. WATT thought the Amendment would complicate the machinery of the Bill. The offender would not be a person but a newspaper, and the difficulty of tracing the connection between the newspaper and the person present at the meeting who had communicated the confidential matter would be very great.

*MR. MASTERMAN hoped the hon. Baronet would see his way to withdraw the Amendment. It was perfectly true that it was within the scope of the Bill, but in its application it would go far beyond the scope of the Bill. As far as he could judge it would allow a town council to exclude one of its own members if he communicated confidental statements to the Press. He had no objection to that; it might be a good thing. Such things had been done, he regretted to say, even in connection with Committees of the House of Commons, but he did not think it ought to be brought within the Bill, which dealt entirely with the Press. Confidential documents might be a difficulty, but the Press were at the present time present at the great majority of town council discussions, and it was his experience that they habitually responded to that kind of appeal; whereas if they passed this Amendment it would not only exclude confidential documents but give the local authority the right to prevent the Press reporting things, even verbal indecencies—using indecencies as a mild expression, such as scenes in the council, which were certainly scandals but which ought to be reported.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow) strongly opposed the Amendment. Committees of local authorities conducted many of the affairs of the local authorities, and it was often desirable that their transactions should be reported in the Press. The Amendment, however, would tend towards shutting out from the ratepayers any information as to the transactions of such committees. On those grounds he strongly opposed the Amendment. He believed that the transactions of popularly elected men in these committees ought to be open to the public Press, and if that had been the case up to now there would not have been any scandals such as those which had been revealed in recent times in regard to the business transacted by certain boards of guardians.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said he wanted to ask his hon. friend to withdraw his Amendment. If it applied only to the Press it was not wanted, for when an appeal was made to the Press not to publish any matter on the ground that it was not for the public interest that it should be published, it was his experience that they always responded and did not publish the matter in question. But if the Amendment applied to the members of the local authorities he could not for a moment support it. No doubt members of local authorities sometimes did publish what had better not be made public; bnt if a member so offending were to be excluded for three months, it was not he who would be punished but those who sent him to the authority, and he did not think it was in the public interest that such a power of exclusion should be given to any public body whatever.

SIR F. BANBURY thought that on the whole the opinion of the House was against the Amendment, and although he thought it would act well, he did not intend to press it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CAVE moved to insert after "regulations," the words "as to the evidence to be furnished of the appointment of representatives of the Press, and." The effect of it would be that any person claiming to be a representative of the Press might be required to produce some credentials. He thought the local authority ought not to be put in the position that a person whom they did not know might claim to be admitted as representing the Press. There might be cases where someone with no credentials desired to enter the Press gallery, and the authority might have to admit somebody who had no right to admission, or if they excluded him they might under the Bill, as it stood, be proceeded against. He did not think any elaborate evidence of authority should be required, but that there should be power to make a regulation requiring that the representative should produce a pass or card to show the officials that he really represented a paper.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'regulations,' to insert the words 'as to the evidence to be furnished of the appointment of representatives of the Press and.' "—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON thought there was a good deal in the point that the local authority should be satisfied that a Press representative was really acting officially on behalf of his paper, and he was going to accept an Amendment later on inserting the words "duly accredited representative." He did not know whether that would meet the point of his hon. and learned friend. If, however, it did not he was prepared to accept this Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. WINFREY (Norfolk, S.W.) moved to insert in line 19, after "representatives," the words "direct or indirect." His object, he said, was to cover news agency correspondents and so forth. He thought his proposal would be accepted by the hon. Member for Barnard Castle.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 19, after the word 'representatives,' to insert the words 'direct or indirect.' "—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON thought it was really necessary to accept some such words in order to safeguard the representatives of Press associations.

MR. MASTERMAN said the words "direct or indirect" would really not strengthen the clause. He would submit that the proper place to discuss the question of Press agencies was at the end of Clause 2, where the hon. Gentleman had some Amendments which he thought both the promoters of the Bill and the Government were prepared to accept.

MR. CAVE thought the words "indirect representatives of the Press" very vague, and he hoped they would not be inserted.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. WINFREY moved to insert at the end of line 20, after "opinions" the words "or on the ground of any reports or comments published by such newspaper." He thought it was obvious that these words would very much improve the clause on the ground that sometimes newspapers might be excluded because of comments published editorially.

MR. CLOUGH seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 20, after the word 'opinions,' to insert the words 'or on the ground of any reports or comments published by such newspaper.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON thought the words introduced a very great improvement, and he accepted them.

Question put, and agreed to.

*MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) moved to insert in line 20, after "newspaper," the words "or through the agency of such representatives." An agency might give offence in some way to a local authority, and he thought it would strengthen the clause and safeguard the public if the representative of a news agency was also not debarred from exercising his calling in that way.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH seconded.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 20, after the word 'newspaper,' to insert the words 'or through the agency of such representatives.'"—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON said, having regard to the fact that they had not inserted "direct or indirect" he was disposed to accept the Amendment. It seemed to him that they would require some words to cover the case of the representatives of various Press associations. If this was the right place to insert the words he accepted them.

MR. MASTERMAN said that this was a penal clause, and as agencies were admitted in the last section of Clause 2, he thought it might be desirable, if not altogether essential, to insert the words in this place.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. GUINNESS moved the insertion of the following words: "Nothing in this Act shall prevent the exclusion of the representatives of any newspaper on the ground of the publication of confidential documents." He felt that it was necessary to move this Amendment in view of the fact that the hon. Baronet the Member for the City had withdrawn his Amendment. The Amendment which he now proposed was to deal with a difficulty which might very often arise. There was a case only last week in the London County Council where a document marked "private and confidential," a report officially to the council, and intended only for the use of members, had been obtained by a certain newspaper and published by them, although they stated in their columns that it was marked "private and confidential." He thought in a case like that the local authority ought to be in a position to protect themselves.

VISCOUNT MORPETH seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the Bill.

"In page 1, line 20, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'nothing in this Act shall prevent the exclusion of the representatives of any newspaper on the ground of the publication of confidential documents.' "—(*Mr. Guinness.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) hoped the Government would not accept the Amendment. It seemed to him that the hon. Member was taking the opportunity afforded by this Bill to drag in a local question pertaining to the London County Council. When opportunity offered, there would be a full and adequate reply to the suggestion which the hon. Member had made. If the Amendment were adopted, it would give a great power to the local authority. What would be the position? A local authority would only need to call everyone of their documents "private and confidential" to keep all information from the public. Who was to decide what was "private and confidential"? The very case to which the hon. Member alluded was the strongest argument that could be put forward against the Amendment. He understood that the document referred to was of an entirely public character, and surely it was open to the Press to doubt the wisdom of a committee or of a local authority who might be disposed to mark any and every document "private and confidential." He thought that in this instance it was the chairman of the committee who had described it as "private and confidential." But whether it was or not it did not alter his objection to the Amendment. He thought that the Bill without it would be strong enough, and to insert the words proposed would encourage local authorities to mark too many of their documents "private and confidential," and to keep important facts entirely from the public.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON hoped the Amendment would not be pressed. In the first place, this subsection was really drafted by those for whom the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment was really acting. In Committee upstairs he had promised that he would meet the hon. Member's point, and he had met it by accepting this subsection. Having done so, he thought it was just a little unfair on the Report stage to ask him to accept such a drastic Amendment as was now proposed. For that reason and for other reasons which he could state, he must decline to accept the Amendment.

MR. MASTERMAN hoped the hon. Member for Bury would see his way to withdraw the Amendment, especially as they had given way on the point of a two-thirds majority, and an absolute majority. The Amendment did not really deal with the Bill. This clause was a special clause against newspapers. There had been a long debate in that House in reference to *The Times* newspaper's publishing confidential documents of Committees, and if the Amendment were adopted, they might have the town council of Orkney and Shetland, if Orkney and Shetland had a town council, excluding *The Times* reporter because *The Times* in London had published a confidential report or document of that House. That was an impossible position so far as this Bill was concerned, and they held that, if there was any discussion on a confidential document, it was for the local authority by a majority to declare that it was inexpedient in the public interest that the Press should be admitted. If, however, representatives of the Press were admitted, they should have a right to publish the document, but the Press should not be held responsible or penalised if they obtained it through another source.

VISCOUNT MORPETH said that the Bill was now in the House of Commons, and not upstairs in Committee, and they had their rights in that House, irrespective of arrangements come to between parties upstairs. He had no knowledge of the quarrel that had taken place in the London County Council in regard to the publication in the Press of a confidential document. He did not know in that particular case on which side the rights were. But it was quite obvious, looking at it from a general point of view, that in the London County Council there must be some documents of a confidential character, and who was to be the authority to decide that a document was confidential, and treat it as such? Was it to be the local body which was entrusted with the duty of administering local affairs, or was it to be the Press? Were the Press to be the judge of whether a document ought to be confidential? Anyone could imagine quite easily that there were a great many things in local government which it was desirable to keep confidential, at any rate, for a time. There were now under the Education Act a great many matters affecting the discipline of teachers in the schools, in which delicate inquiries had to be made, and it might be most prejudicial to justice if they were made public before they were completed, and whilst the papers were still private, and ought to be private. During the holding of such inquiries it would be most undesirable that the proceedings should be published broadcast in the Press. Anybody could easily understand that in such a case as the purchase of lands and sites it would be most prejudicial to the interests of the public that there should be reports published in regard to the estimates of cost, while the documents were still confidential. There ought to be some means of dealing with a newspaper which wilfully disregarded these private and confidential matters, and which, judging for themselves, were a law to themselves and published things which ought to be regarded as private. For that reason he supported the hon. Gentleman in his Amendment because it seemed to him that the penalty was a very mild one for what might be a very serious offence.

*MR. BYLES (Salford, N.) said he did not see how a document which was read in a public local authority with seventy or eighty representatives could be confidential. The noble Lord had suggested cases where negotiations were going on for the acquisition of land, and it was very undesirable that the public should know the intermediate processes in the transaction. No doubt it was very undesirable indeed, but no public authority would be foolish enough to read such a document while negotiations of that kind were in progress, and if they did, although the reporters were absolutely forbidden under penalty to publish it, with eighty representatives it would be out directly, and very likely some of these representatives would go and secure the property for themselves. It was of the last importance that all transactions affecting the public and local public resources should be watched by the public or the Press which represented the public. Another objection which he had to the Amendment was that it proposed to punish a newspaper, which published one of these confidential documents, even inadvertently, or by an error of judgment, for ever. That was to say, if a document had appeared in the leading local paper which had been criticising rather smartly the doings of a local authority, they would for ever after that be excluded from the public body.

*MR. NANNETTI hoped the House would not accept the Amendment. It was admitted that the Press would be excluded, and if a document marked "private and confidential" was circulated in the Press it was proposed to punish the newspaper. Why should they punish the newspaper for the action of an individual who was on his honour asked to keep a document confidential and strictly private? That was a matter for the corporation or the local body that had to deal with it. If a member abused the privilege or gave a copy to a newspaper, he could not for the life of him see why the newspaper should be compelled not to publish that document if they so desired. It might even be in the public interest. It might happen that a document of vital interest to the public might be marked "private and confidential" and then no newspaper would dare to publish because of the penalty that the Bill would impose. Any of the members present at the meeting might give a copy of a document and it would be an interference with the liberty of the Press to prohibit its publication under such circumstances. They were the best judges as to whether a document marked "private and confidential" should be published or not, and he thought in that democratic House they were not going to attempt to bring in restrictions on the Press and on responsible editors who knew what they were doing and would not publish a document dealing, for instance, with the sale of land. With regard to the document relating to London County Council finance, the universal opinion was that it should have been published. He was not going to find fault with the paper that published it. It was quite justified in publishing it. Having had the document given them it would be a mistake if the Press did not use their judgment and publish it if they so desired. He hoped the Amendment would not be accepted.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Dr. MACNAMARA, Camberwell, N.) did not deny that this was not at all an easy matter. On the face of it it would almost appear that they wanted some punitive power over a Press representative who misused the right which this Bill conferred on him. At the instance of the hon. Baronet they had said that by a bare majority they could exclude Press representatives as often as they pleased during the course of a meeting. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were afraid lest, notwithstanding these precautions, they might get into their hands a confidential document and make an improper use of it. The noble Lord the Member for South Birmingham was particularly anxious about that and spoke of the early publication of matters affecting the purchase of land and the disciplinary treatment of teachers. He was a little surprised to hear it from him because the noble Lord was for a number of years Chairman of the School Accommodation Committee of the London School Board, and he should say never under any circumstances had he to complain of any misuse at any time in these very important matters by the Press of any private and confidential information which might possibly have come into their hands.

VISCOUNT MORPETH: I have no personal complaint, nor do I know personally any instance of a grievance, but I want to guard against cases that might arise.

DR. MACNAMARA said that was what he thought. But a local authority might mark all its papers "private and confidential" and defeat the whole object of the Bill, which was to confer on the Press a right which it did not at present possess. Then under the terms of the Amendment, because of the misuse of a document—and he did not understand how it could come into his hands, because he could be turned out as often as was desired during one meeting whenever a matter of a confidential character turned up—but if it came into the reporter's hands by some mysterious means he could be turned out for ever. He was sure the mover would not go quite so far. Then there was the point made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board that if a member of the local authority for reasons best known to himself, having access to all private and confidential documents, handed them to the Press, the result would be that the unfortunate Press representative would be turned out. Although he admitted the difficulty and could not but admit the reasonableness of having some punitive power for misuse, this was not a form in which they could in any practical way apply it, and he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

MR. RAWLINSON said the hon. Gentleman had failed to appreciate the position of those who were pressing the Amendment. It had a much wider scope than he had realised. There was a document which the local authority were of opinion was confidential. A newspaper got hold of it by some means or other. It was absolutely impossible for the local authority to prove who was the person who had given it up. At present the local authority had full power to deal with newspapers. This Bill was going to take that power away; therefore he asked the House to pause before they did that and left no power to deal with what might be a very serious matter. The hon. Gentleman appealed to his noble friend whether or not he ever had any trouble with the Press when at the school board. But they were taking away the power which the local authority had now of dealing with the Press. One obvious reason why they had had no trouble was that they had the means of dealing with it if trouble occurred. But further than that, they knew that confidential documents had been disclosed from time to time. By whom? That was exactly the difficulty they were invariably met by, and suspicion was thrown on clerks and others who had had possession of the document.

MR. DALZIEL: The reporter may have the contents summarised and sent to him.

MR. RAWLINSON said in that case the local authority whom they were trusting with such very great powers in other matters would never think of dealing unfairly with a newspaper which did such a thing as that. They must trust the local authority not to do such a grave act of injustice as to treat a newspaper unfairly in that way. They must assume that the local authority knew the tremendous importance of the power which resided in them, and some part of which should be kept in their hands, and that they would only deal with newspapers who had got hold of documents which were really furnished by a breach of trust on the part of somebody, it was impossible to say whom, and therefore were making money out of the publication of a confidential document, and so increasing their circulation to the exclusion of other papers who had run perfectly straight. He had had a great deal to do with confidential documents, and he knew the temptation to which clerks in receipt of small salaries were exposed. It was idle to tell him he had to prove who had broken his trust before the newspaper published the document, because it could not be proved. But local authority ought to have some power in its hands. It had it now, and the Bill ought not to take away such a power to deal with a newspaper which had in their opinion published a document contrary to the express wish of the local authority. The hon. Member for Dublin asked who was the best judge. Surely the local authority must be made the judge in the matter. In this very Bill they had given the power to exclude the Press as often as they liked. If they excluded them whilst a confidential document was being read and it was published directly afterwards the exclusion was worse than a farce, because they simply hit the pressman who had played the game and not published the confidential document, and it would be to the benefit of the particular paper which had managed to get the document. For that reason this should be supported as an important Amendment. It was of the last importance that many documents should not be made common property. As they were taking away a power, some sort of restriction of the kind should be left in the Bill. It could do no harm to the Press, and he was sure local authorities could be entrusted with power to deal with the Press who had knowingly published a confidential document.

LORD R. CECIL said the Goverment did not really quite appreciate the basis on which the Bill rested. Everybody knew it rested on the celebrated case in which a local authority unfairly excluded representatives, not of the Press at large, but of a particular newspaper. That was the grievance they had to meet, and the whole point of the Bill was to prevent such a thing being done, and the first clause, which gave power to exclude in the public interest, said specifically that one newspaper must not be excluded and another admitted. The Amendment as drafted would undoubtedly destroy the whole Bill. There could not be any question about that. A local authority would merely have to mark every single document "confidential," or afterwards decide that it was, and proceed to exclude the newspaper in the future. Then it did not say "knowingly published." If the newspaper accidentally published they would have the power to do it. Lastly, the exclusion would be quite indefinite, and it would not be effective because the newspaper would be able to make arrangements with other newspapers if it was unscrupulous, and go on doing what it had done before. The Amendment would not be successful. It went much too far as far as drafting was concerned, and if there was anything in the danger—for he was not disposed to say there was nothing—it would have to be dealt with by a very different kind of Amendment, and could only be considered, if at all, in another place when they had time to consider exactly what could be done and what could not. He hoped the hon. Member would see his way to withdraw the Amendment without prejudice to his being able to raise the matter on another occasion.

*MR. GUINNESS said he quite realised that the House was in rather a difficulty in discussing the Amendment because of necessity he had only put it down at the last moment, and he also realised that there were strong objections to the present form of wording, but he thought that could be dealt with so as to meet points that had been raised. The point that the Amendment involved the permanent exclusion of the Press could easily be met by putting in the words "pending satisfactory explanation," and if the newspaper showed that it did not do it wilfully, the exclusion could of course immediately be cancelled. There was another point which also had a good deal of force, that the newspaper might not know that the documents were private and confidential. That could easily be met by omitting the words "confidential documents" at the end and penalising newspapers from the publication of documents issued by the local authority to its members as private and confidential. The particular point which he had in his mind was that newspapers could now boast of issuing these private and confidential documents,and he thought in the interests of local government it was most necessary that officials of local authorities should be protected from this undesirable publication. It was most necessary that the officials should be free from any suspicion of party bias, and if their private recommendations to a committee could be published by a newspaper, he thought they made the position of the permanent officials of these authorities practically impossible. He did not think there was any danger of newspapers being excluded without just cause if they made it an essential that these documents should have been issued and marked "private and confidential." If they did not agree with this Amendment they would put a great advantage in the hands of those newspapers who were unscrupulous enough to publish an official document with a view to improving their circulation. The Secretary to the Admiralty asked the noble Lord the Member for South Birmingham whether, when he was on the London School Board, he ever met any case of misuse of privilege by the Press, and his hon. friend said he did not; but in those days the Press could be very easily penalised, and there was nothing to prevent the London School Board, if the Press had published a confidential document, saying: "We will keep out the representative of that particular newspaper." But if the Bill passed in its present form that deterrent would be taken away from the Press, and they would be able to publish confidential documents with absolute inpunity. He hoped the Amendment would be accepted in the form which he now proposed, limiting the period until there was a satisfactory explanation, and the documents to those issued as private and confidential.

* MR. MASTERMAN said the course the hon. Member was adopting was an impossible way of doing business. The hon. Member confessed that this idea had never occurred to him until the hon. Baronet spoke. Surely this was a question of a penal clause quite apart from the Bill. He was not satisfied with these alterations. It might conceivably be desirable that it should be made possible to prosecute the Press in certain circumstances under due safeguards; but that was a totally different matter from excluding Press representatives. If the Press wished to publish confidential documents, it had no difficulty in getting those documents from other sources. It might be desirable that a Bill penalising the Press should be introduced, but he submitted that this was not the proper place to do it.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch) hoped the House would not accept the Amendment in one form or the other. During the ten years he had been a member of the London County Council he never remembered the public interest being seriously injured by publications in the Press, though great inconvenience had sometimes been caused to parties. A public authority could call any document "private and confidential." Indeed, practically every document of the London County Council except the Council agenda paper and one or two papers circulated with it was already so marked. It was ridiculous to give a local authority power to mark all its documents confidential, and then take action against the Press.

SIR ARTHUR BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs), referring to the obligation imposed by the words "private and confidential" upon a letter, recalled a case in which the Duke of Wellington, when Prime Minister, received a letter so marked, and sent it the following morning to the Press. The Duke's argument was, first, that the writer had no justification for marking the letter "private"; and, secondly, that the right of so treating it or not was in the receiver and not in the writer of the document. He could not support the Amendment to the Amendment.

SIR F. BANBURY agreed that this was a very difficult matter. No one wanted to prevent the Press from publishing what ought to be published, but there was a possibility that they might publish some document, as they thought in the interest of the public, which ought not to be published. Therefore he thought that, on the whole, some safeguard was necessary, and he should vote with his hon. friend. The reason given for passing the Bill was that in an isolated case one newspaper had been excluded, but it should not be overlooked that they were now dealing with all newspapers. He confessed that he was not much enamoured of local self-government, but it was a little hard to allow the Press to be judges as to whether a document was confidential or not, as had been suggested by the hon. Member for Dublin.

MR. NANNETTI said that what he suggested was that the Press should be allowed to use their discretion as to whether they published them or not.

SIR F. BANBURY said that what would happen under this proposal was that the Press would be excluded altogether.

MR. GUINNESS asked leave to withdraw his original Amendment, and to substitute the improved form of words he had suggested to the House.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 20, after the words last inserted to insert the words 'Provided also that nothing in this Act shall prevent the exclusion pending satisfactory explanation of representatives of any newspaper on the ground of the publication of documents issued by the local authority to its members as private and confidential'"—(*Mr. Guinness*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Sir Arthur Bignold.

* MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH said he could not see that the hon. Member had in any way improved a wholly impracticable proposal. If documents could be marked in such a way that every man would know they were private and confidential it might be useful to have some legislation on the point; but the difficulty was that the Press had no means of knowing whether a document was private and confidential or not. He held that if punishment was to be meted out it should be meted out to the proper person, that was, the person who circulated the private and confidential document. He had never known a case of a private document being brought to a newspaper, except by a person to whom it had been confided. Where a document was known to be private and confidential, and when it was not to the public interest to publish it, the practice was to suppress it. He would like to see some steps taken to punish the actual offender. He did not think the hon. Member had improved his Amendment by the alteration he had suggested, and he hoped it would be rejected unanimously by the House.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL moved to strike out from the Amendment the words "pending a satisfactory explanation" in order to insert the words "for a period not exceeding three months." He said they did not wish to put any penalty on the Press, and if a satisfactory explanation were forthcoming the exclusion would probably not exceed a week.

MR. CARLILE seconded.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment to the Bill—

"To leave out the words 'pending satisfactory explanation,' and to insert the words 'for a period not exceeding three months,"—(*Mr. Staveley-Hill.*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'pending satisfactory explanation' stand part of the proposed Amendment to the Bill."

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON asked if it was in order upon this Bill to deal with matters that might never arise as part of the business of those local authorities. The Amendment referred to documents which might be sent privately to the members of the authority, and might never come before the actual meeting.

Viscount MORPETH suggested that the provision should be exclusion for having violated confidence.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER said he thought the Amendment was quite in order. The exclusion proposed was within the scope of the Bill.

Mr. DALZIEL said that this Amendment was asking the council to declare some offender guilty, expel him, and then ask him to furnish a satisfactory explanation. Surely the proper course to take would be to write and ask for this explanation before penalising the offending person. The suggestion in the Amendment seemed to him absurd. According to the Bill if a newspaper published a document which was regarded as confidential the clerk would be instructed to make a representation to the newspaper and then the Committee would decide whether there was any ground for action. By this Amendment they were proposing to expel the newspaper without any opportunity of being heard. ["No."] They must leave a certain amount of discretion to the local authority. Were they going to penalise the reporter and say that for three months he was not to be admitted? In that case the editor could easily send another member of his staff, or he could obtain a report from other sources. Whatever clause of this kind they introduced with the object of limiting the Press they could easily find ways of getting round it.

Mr. GUINNESS said his Amendment would not prevent the clerk to a local authority communicating with the newspaper before taking action.

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Question put, "That the words 'Provided also that nothing in this Act shall prevent the exclusion for a period not exceeding three months of representatives of any newspaper on the ground of the publication of documents issued by the local authority to its members as private and confidential' be inserted after the last Amendment made to the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 40; Noes, 164. (Division List No. 139.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave George
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham
Haddock, George B.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson,John Frederick Pee
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Staveley-Hill,Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Guinness and Viscount Morpeth.

NOES.

Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Bryce, J. Annan
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(Montgomery Co)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H.(St.Pancras,N

Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt HnSir W.Brampton
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
Mallet, Charles E.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan. J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murphy, N. J. (Kilkenny, S.)
Murray,Capt.Hn AC.(Kincard.)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(A'ht'n-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick,B.)
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Master of Elibank and Captain Norton.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out the words 'any newspaper,' and to insert the words 'the Press.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, to leave out the word 'it,' and to insert the word 'they.'"—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. MASTERMAN said subsection (3) of Clause 1 gave the representative of any newspaper the right of appeal to the Local Government Board if he felt aggrieved by the regulations made by a local authority for the accommodation of the representatives of the Press. The subsection gave the Local Government Board power to vary or alter such regulations, but there was nothing in the Bill to prevent the local authority from going back next day to the old regulations. He moved to amend the subsection by adding words which would prevent the local authority from taking such action.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, at end, to add the words 'and no regulations in so far as they are so varied or altered shall be subsequently varied or rescinded by the local authority without the consent of the Board.'"—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

*MR. LAMONT (Buteshire) moved an Amendment to provide that notice of meetings of the local authority should be sent by the clerk not only to the editor as proposed, but to the local representative of any newspaper circulating in the district of the local authority. As illustrating the necessity for this Amendment, he stated that one of the papers which circulated most largely in his constituency was published at Largs. Great delay would be caused if notice had to be sent to the editor at Largs instead of to the local representative at Millport. As he understood from the hon. Member for Barnard Castle that he would accept this Amendment, he would not further detain the House by argument in its favour.

MR. WATT seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 1, after the word 'editor, to insert the words 'or the local representative.'"—(*Mr. Lamont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. CARLILE said that, while he had all sympathy with the Press, he thought this Amendment was an undue extension of the subsection. Was the correspondent in every little village to be recognised as the local representative of a newspaper to whom the clerk of the local authority was to be obliged to send notice of meetings? The Amendment would make the subsection far too wide, and he hoped the obligation placed upon the clerk would be confined to sending notice to the editor who was the responsible person on the staff of a newspaper.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) hoped the Amendment would not be accepted. If these words were inserted, the clerk of the local authority would be liable to be charged with a breach of duty because he did not comply with a written request to be furnished with notices of meetings from one who described himself as the local representative of a newspaper. The editor was not inaccessible, and he was surely enough for all practical purposes. He objected to so peremptory a duty as the Amendment required being placed on the clerk of the local authority.

MR. BYLES said he did not think the hon. Baronet understood the position. The Amendment appeared to be perfectly reasonable. It was reasonable that the local representative in a small country town should be the recipient of the notices of meetings. The editor might be in a city a considerable distance away. If a newspaper had a branch office in a town fifty miles away from the place of publication, it would be absurd to require that the notice should be sent to the editor to be re-transmitted to the representative on the spot who was responsible for the reports of the meetings of that particular local authority.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he wished cordially to support the Amendment. He thought hon. Members opposite who had opposed the Amendment did not realise the situation. The local representatives of newspapers were often separated by long distances from the editor, and unless the subsection were amended, the newspapers concerned would be under great disabilities. He would take the case of a newspaper with a circulation in a group of boroughs edited at one borough, and with a competing paper at another borough. The editor could not personally conduct all the business or make all applications to the local authority, while on the other hand the local representative of such a newspaper would be a perfectly well-known and trustworthy person, and he submitted that there was very good reason in scattered constituencies for adopting the Amendment, of which he cordially approved.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON said that if they did not accept some such Amendment they were going to alter what had been the custom, especially in rural districts, for very many years. He could give a concrete illustration. In his own constituency there were two leading morning newspapers circulated. They had representatives who were in constant touch with the local authorities, and they got notices of meetings. If the notices in future were to be sent to the editors twenty miles away, the existing arrangements would be disturbed. He was prepared to accept the Amendment.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON opposed the Amendment on the ground that it went a great deal too far. He thought every one of the villages in his own constituency had representatives of the Tory or Radical Press of Hull. Were these local representatives to be in a position to request the clerk of the local authority to send them notices of meetings? He thought the hon. Member might be content with having notice sent to the editor or sub-editor.

Dr. MACNAMARA said that this was a matter of mutual local convenience, purely administrative, and not a very serious one. The Bill was rather a useful little Bill, containing one or two important matters of principle which he hoped they might be allowed to come to. With regard to the Amendment, he reminded the House that the promoter of the Bill had undertaken in the definition of newspaper representative to add "duly accredited." If this was added a great part of the difficulty would disappear.

Question put, and agreed to.

Sir F. BANBURY moved to leave out the words "circulating in the district of the local authority." He did not see why the subsection should be restricted by these words. What was good for one was good for all.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 2, to leave out the words 'circulating in the district of the local authority.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

*Mr. LAMONT moved an Amendment providing that the notice of a meeting sent to the editor should be accompanied "with the agenda of business." In order to carry out this Amendment it would only be necessary to print a few more copies of the agenda, and he did not think that would involve much additional cost.

Mr. WATT seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 3, after the word 'notice,' to insert the words 'with agenda of the business.'"—(*Mr. Lamont.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. GUINNESS hoped the House would not accept this Amendment. He believed it would involve large additional expense to the local authorities. The mover of the Amendment thought it would only mean the printing of a few extra agendas. He himself thought it would mean the printing of a few hundred extra agendas. Perhaps the mover did not realise that in many cases the agenda contained a great deal of interesting information, and to supply it to a large number of newspapers would be to provide them with cheap and economical "copy." It seemed to him it was enough that the agenda paper should be sent to the reporters who actually attended the meetings. If it was sent to every newspaper in the kingdom it would entail great additional expense from which they would get no advantage in return.

*Mr. REES said that if the words "circulating in the district" were thrown out, as he understood they had been, it was absolutely necessary to reject the Amendment, because there would be no limit to the trouble and expense caused by it. There was enough printing done nowadays which nobody read. One of the greatest troubles of the age was the growth of printed matter, and even the throwing of it into the waste-basket occupied a great deal of valuable time.

Sir FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said that the hon. Gentleman had not considered the extremely ponderous character of these agenda papers, the distribution of which would lay an inconvenient burden and expense on the local authorities. All that was wanted was covered by the words "due notice."

*Mr. LAMONT said that it seemed to him that if the editor had a copy of the agenda paper it would enable him to decide whether it was necessary to send a reporter to the meeting or not. However, after the expression of opinion which had been given, he asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, at end, to add the words 'and wilful neglect to do so on the part of such clerk or other officer shall be an offence punishable at summary jurisdiction by fine not exceeding five pounds.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. MASTERMAN said he had an Amendment to propose which was rather important and which he hoped the House would accept unanimously. It was to omit subsection (b), which provided that an education committee, established by a council under the Education Act, 1902, should, for the purposes of this Act, be a "local authority," so far as regarded its proceedings which did not have to be reported to the council for confirmation. Representations had been made that an education committee, acting as an executive authority, was in exactly the same position as many other committees, and therefore the Government asked the House to omit the subsection making it a general rule that that publicity should be given. Then, if this Motion to omit were carried, when he came to propose the amended clause he would move it in a somewhat different fashion. Representations had been made that, from the nature of the business transacted, it would be exceedingly inexpedient to throw all these committees open generally to the Press. They did not insist upon throwing open a watch committee, the committee dealing with the discipline of the police force, and the visiting committee under the Lunacy Act. These were considered private and confidential. But in the case of other committees with delegated powers, for instance, of an out-relief committee of a board of guardians, when they discussed delicate details and took no action except to report to the board, their proceedings would be private; but when the committee, instead of reporting to the central body, dealt with cases themselves, then it was desirable the Press should be admitted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, to leave out subsection (*b*)."—(*Mr. Masterman.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'an education committee' stand part of the Bill."

SIR FRANCIS POWELL said he knew how extremely confidential the matters were which were discussed by the relief committees of boards of guardians, and with that reservation he thought the Amendment might stand.

*MR. GUINNESS thought that it was most undesirable that this suggestion should be accepted. It would be perfectly impossible to distinguish between the business of the committee to which the Press should be admitted under the new subsection and the business from which they ought to be excluded. He had spoken to the clerk of the London County Council, who had had large experience, and who told him that in his opinion it would be practically impossible to distinguish those items on the agenda paper which were dealt with under powers which devolved on the committee and those upon which the committee had to report to the council. Moreover, it would be impossible without an enormous amount of inconvenience to have the Press representatives present at one moment, and not at another. He quite agreed with what had been said as to the relief committees. He thought that the wording of the new clause was very ambiguous. There were many subjects remitted to the committees on which they took no action. That was in the discretion of the committees themselves. There was the structural question also. There was no room for the Press representatives in the committee rooms. It might be suggested that the committees should meet in the council chamber; but that would be impracticable, for a number of the committees met at the same time on the same day. The great advantage of the committee system in local government was, that it got rid of the party bias which so often cramped business at the meetings of the whole local body. They all knew that many members frequently discussed business more with an eye to the effect which it would have upon their subsequent re-election than in the interests of the ratepayers; and if the representatives of the Press were allowed at every committee meeting the same vicious principle would be introduced there. At the present time a great deal of work was done in committee in the most expeditious manner possible, because the Press were not present and there was no inducement to members to make speeches. Another advantage of the absence of the Press representatives was that in the administrative work of the committee the officials could come in and speak their minds freely. If the reporters were present, the words of these officials might be twisted to serve party purposes, and efficient local government would no longer be possible. Municipal officials, like Civil Service officials, should be free from party bias. At present it was difficult enough to obtain business men of sufficient leisure to undertake the duties of local government and to attend committee meetings; but if the Press were admitted to these meetings the proceedings would be spun out from two or three to six or even seven hours, which a busy man could not afford to give up. It had been said that the presence of the Press at committee meetings checked corruption; but he thought that corruption could perfectly well be prevented by any honest member of the committee, if he chose, bringing the whole question before the council. Freedom of the Press did not mean that the committee rooms should be thrown open to the Press to report confidential matters which in the interests of the community should not be made public

*MR. BYLES said he felt there was a good deal in the arguments pressed by the hon. Member. He himself spoke from considerable experience when he said that the newspapers did not desire their representatives to attend all Committee meetings, nor did they make constant inquiry into confidential details. As he understood from the hon. Member in charge of the Bill, wherever a public body had the power of levying a rate on the public that was a meeting at which the Press were entitled to be present. He was disposed to accept the Amendment with the view of lightening the Bill and making progress.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he should very much regret if by omitting subsection (*b*) the House lost altogether the results of a discussion on the later clauses. He was aware that when the Education Act of 1902 came into force the exclusion of the public from committee meetings was not an advantage. It was exceedingly important that the public should know what took place at these committee meetings. On the other hand, anyone who had taken part in the deliberations of municipal bodies and their committees knew very well that the presence of reporters destroyed discussion of important questions when an election was drawing near. The committees worked with unimpaired energies and always did their duty fairly when there was no election impending.

MR. MASTERMAN said that he had only dealt with committees with delegated powers.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he understood that whenever a committee had executive powers, whether statutory or delegated, the reporters might be present. But in all cases where matters came up to the local authority itself for approval that approval might be merely formal, so that very considerable affairs of public interest might be discussed and really settled in committees from which the reporters would be excluded. He was sorry that the whole question had been delayed to this late stage.

*MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.) said he was sorry that the representative of the Local Government Board proposed to omit subsection (*b*). The promoters of the Bill had done quite right to insert in their definition clause the education committee as a committee at the meetings of which the Press ought to be represented. There was a good deal of plausibility in the suggestion that all committees should be treated alike and there should not be any differentiation, but Parliament had recognised that the functions of an education committee were so large and so important that it was desirable to treat it in a different manner. Ever since the passing of the Education Act of 1902 there had been a conflict among the local authorities as to whether the Press should be admitted or not. He believed that now the Press was admitted to all the Education committees of the various county councils. The London County Council was the last to submit, and they had now fallen into line. But in order to justify the exclusion of the Press they had invented a theory that where there was delegation of powers to the committee there should be publicity, but where there was no delegation the Press should be excluded. He was sorry that the virus of the London County Council had been inoculated into the Local Government Board. He thought the House in deciding that point should not deal with the larger question raised by the Local Government Board as to whether the Press was to be admitted to all committees. The hon. Members' theory broke down in practice. They could not sit down in committee and distinguish in a moment when the Press should be excluded and when not. The Press came in and stayed all the time. It had been found in practice that the differentiation between the delegated and the other functions of a committee was impracticable, and the distinction, if embodied in an Act of Parliament, would be futile. He hoped the Amendment proposed from the Treasury Bench would not be persisted in.

LORD R. CECIL said the promoters of the Bill did not really care very much how the House decided this point. They felt there was a distinction between the education and other committees because as a matter of fact people took more interest in education than in other controversial matters. There was also a great deal of force in what was stated by the hon. Member. If the House thought fit to accept the Amendment proposed by the Government it would not interfere with the views of the promoters so far as this Bill was concerned, but he suggested that it might be desirable, in order to save time, to allow the Bill to stand as it was.

MR. MASTERMAN said the noble Lord had anticipated what he thought of suggesting. If the House approved he would withdraw the Amendment to omit the subsection, reserving his right to move a new subsection upon which the question of an education committee could be considered on its merits.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. WINFREY moved to add after "committee," the words "and a joint education committee." This was specially provided for in the Act of 1902. There were certain county councils who had a joint education committee and he suggested that the words were necessary to make the definition complete.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, after the word 'Committee,' to insert the words 'and a joint education committee.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

LORD R. CECIL agreed that, as a matter of drafting, the words should be inserted.

VISCOUNT MORPETH thought there should be some further information as to what the joint committee was. There were many different kinds of joint committees, some of which had very great and others very limited powers conferred upon them. It could not be too often impressed upon this House that to admit the Press to committee meetings was very often to waste time, to introduce party politics, and to lead to the introduction of speeches to the hindrance of the work for which these committees were appointed—purely administrative work. He welcomed the statement by the hon. Member for Salford who had urged upon the House on every occasion that they should allow the Press access to meetings of local authorities, but that he did not claim and did not desire that they should be admitted to committee meetings, because he recognised that by so doing the work of the committee might be made slower.

LORD R. CECIL pointed out that the Amendment was limited by the words of the subsection and did not extend beyond those cases in which the committees were not required to submit their decision to the county council for approval. The point was of great importance, but he thought it would be better raised later on.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 188 ; Noes, 48. (Division List No. 140.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bryce, J. Annan
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH(Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guinness, Walter Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murphy, N. J. (Kilkenny, S.)
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Winfrey and Mr. Holt.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Magnus, Sir Philip
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)

Tellers for the Noes—Viscount Morpeth and Mr. Ashley.

Mr. WINFREY said the next Amendment was consequential.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 16, to leave out the words 'by a council.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WINFREY said his next Amendment was to leave out all the words after "1902." It had already been pointed out during the discussion that it was practically impossible for the Press to distinguish between matters that were and were not to be submitted by a committee to a council, and it would be better to leave out the words and trust to the discretion of the Press from time to time.

Mr. HOLT (Northumberland, Hexham) seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 17, to leave out from the word '1902,' to end of line 20."—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Dr. MACNAMARA expressed the hope that the words would be allowed to remain in the Bill. It was one of the original objects of the promoters and, therefore, the Bill as amended upstairs took the form that when the education committees dealt with matters that they were competent to carry into effect without reporting to the council the Press should be present. Wherever the education committee was dealing as a committee, discussing questions upon which they would have to report to the parent committee, the Press were not to be admitted. This Amendment would result in ensuring that the Press was present on every occasion. He, therefore, suggested that it should not be accepted as it would carry the Bill further than desirable.

Mr. GUINNESS hoped the hon. Member would stick to his Amendment. It was much better to leave these words out and so simplify the Bill in that way.

Viscount MORPETH also asked the hon. Member to adhere to his Amendment. The education committee set up by the Act of 1902 was a different committee from other committees. It was a statutory committee. He was in favour of the Press being admitted to the proceedings of the education committee, and submitted that it was not possible to draw the distinction, which the Secretary to the Admiralty had tried to draw, between that business of the committee which required the approval of the county council and that which did not.

Mr. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) hoped the Bill would be allowed to stand as it was at present. Evil results might follow if all discussions in committees took place in the presence of the Press. For instance, there were such questions as the acquisition of land for school purpose and teachers' salaries and other subjects at the discussions upon which the local Press would no doubt like to be present. He had some experience of these meetings and so far as he knew the Press came in, and after certain matters had been discussed they were told there was nothing more of any public interest to be discussed and they then left. If the Press were always allowed to remain, he did not think it would be in the public interest; therefore, he hoped that the clause would stand as at present.

LORD R. CECIL also expressed the hope that the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment. The Bill did not compel the attendance of the Press, but only gave them a right to be present. He hoped, under these circumstances, as the promoters were very anxious to get the Bill through the House, they might now pass from this matter.

Amendment negatived.

SIR F. BANBURY said that, as the Bill under certain circumstances applied to Ireland, he begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

CAPTAIN J. CRAIG (Down, E.) seconded the Amendment as he considered that in this respect it should be extended to Ireland.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 32, at end, to insert the words '(g) In the application of the Act to Ireland there shall be included boards of guardians, asylum committees, school attendance committees, and boards of any hospitals or infirmaries in receipt of a grant from public funds.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

LORD R. CECIL trusted that this Amendment would not be persisted in. The promoters of the Bill were desirous that it should extend to Ireland, but provision already existed for certain representation in Ireland, and if this Amendment were passed without serious consideration it might lead to serious difficulty.

MR. CARLILE thought that in the interest of the newspaper Press itself the Amendment should be withdrawn. He contended that if one newspaper with a larger capital and more leisure than its contemporaries chose to attend all these meetings its competitors would be compelled also to attend them, and that might involve an intolerable burden being placed upon the Press.

SIR F. BANBURY failed to see why Ireland should be put into a different position from England in this matter. What was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander. He, however, quite agreed with his noble friend that there was a possibility of a difficulty arising, that a number of authorities not included in this Amendment might, upon consideration, be included in it, and, therefore, if his noble friend gave him an assurance that an Amendment having these objects in view would be moved in another place he was quite willing to withdraw his Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL said he was willing to give that undertaking and do his best to meet his right hon. friend.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 1, after the word 'means,' to insert the words 'duly accredited.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

MR. J. P. NANNETTI said that the Amendment he now proposed to move should be taken in conjunction with an Amendment lower down on the Paper. What he desired to do was to insure that accredited representatives of other papers should have this right. The case he had in his mind was this. Supposing an editor of a London newspaper desired to send down a reporter to a particular meeting in the public interest he might under this clause be excluded. He had been advised that unless this Amendment was accepted it would lead to a good deal of hardship. A great scandal might arise at one of these meetings where it might be to the interests of the public that this right should not be confined to the local Press. He moved.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 1, to leave out from the word 'means,' to the end of the clause, and to insert the word 'persons.'"—(*Mr. Nannetti.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'representatives of newspapers' stand part of the Bill."

MR. GUINNESS hoped the House would not accept this Amendment. The Bill was wide enough to enable the whole of the Press to be present and this Amendment if carried would enable people to come in who thought the Press gallery was more comfortable than the public gallery. If all these people were allowed to come in it would be quite impossible for those who ought to be present to do their work under comfortable conditions.

MR. MASTERMAN suggested that this Amendment should be withdrawn and that the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London should move his Amendment moving out the words "circulating in the district of the local authority" and that the hon. Member for Norfolk should move in the words "and of news agencies systematically carrying on the business of selling and supplying reports and information to newspapers." The Government were of opinion that those two Amendments would cover this point.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR F. BANBURY said his next Amendment was in the interests of the Press. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, lines 2 and 3, to leave out the words 'circulating in the district of the loca authority.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 3, after the word 'newspaper,' to insert the words 'and of news agencies systematically carrying on the business of selling and supplying reports and information to newspapers.'"—(*Mr. Winfrey.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

INCEST BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

MR. RAWLINSON said he had put down an Amendment to omit Clause 1 of this Bill. It was a Bill which dealt with a very disagreeable subject, and naturally the sympathy of the House was against the persons who committed the offence which this Bill was brought in to prevent. The reason why he moved to omit this clause was the same as that given by greater authorities than he, namely, Lord Halsbury and Lord Davey in the House of Lords when this Bill was discussed on the last occasion before that House. Those reasons were that the Bill made it an offence subject to a term of penal servitude of not exceeding seven years for all who were convicted of incest with a granddaughter, daughter, sister, or mother. It only dealt, therefore, with certain relatives and subjected the people committing the offence to seven years penal servitude, practically making a fresh crime. The first consideration he would put before the House was that up to the present time these offences against morality had never been made a crime. The House, therefore, should hesitate before making a sweeping addition to the criminal law of England at a late period on a Friday afternoon at the instigation of a private Member. He would deal with the particular reasons which were adduced against the Bill in a moment, but he thought, to start with, there should be a very strong case made out by the promoters of the Bill for making such a change as was proposed. So far as that House was concerned the Bill had never been before the House as a whole. It came on one night after eleven o'clock, and was not discussed. This offence was for the first time made a criminal offence, and subject to the criminal law. If the criminal law was brought in to deal with offences against morals they would be met at every turn with the difficulty that it was adults who committed these immoral offences. The words brother and sister in this Bill included half brother and sisters. Let them take the case of a brother and half sister. Was it right to make such an offence a crime; was it desirable? Once cases of this kind were brought before an Assize Court it would be found, as everybody familiar with the criminal law knew, that a prosecution of this kind would bring up a crop of similar cases in the particular locality. It was well-known that where a case of a disgusting nature came before an Assize Court the mere publication of it resulted in a crop of that particular class of cases.

Further, by making this immoral offence a crime the door was opened to blackmail of every kind. There was a matter which would be brought to bear in all cases where consent was no defence to the particular crime charged. In such a case as he had mentioned the one was put in the power of the other. There was the further difficulty of people who threatened to make false charges in the case of an offence where both parties must be equally guilty, which there would be great trouble to disprove. This offence was not on the same lines as that of rape or anything of that kind. Here was a brother and half-sister living in one house and any person for reasons of enmity or of blackmail could give any information against them. It was a grossly immoral offence, and though he felt it was unpopular to oppose a Bill of this kind in the House, he ventured to submit that before this offence was made a crime the House should see to it that they did not take any step that might do more harm than good. He again wished to impress upon the House that they should be very careful in dealing with a question of this kind not to make a crime of an offence which had never before been treated as a crime in this country. What case was there? There was no suggestion that this offence was on the increase; indeed, it was far less known now than it was twenty or thirty years ago in parts of England, and only now and then was there a case in the criminal Courts. Was there the slightest reason to doubt that the spread of education and of civilising influences was doing away with this evil, and that there was, therefore, less need to deal with the matter so drastically as was proposed by the Bill? His right hon. friend had pointed out that the subject was discussed in 1903 in the House of Commons. True it was, and on that occasion the example of Scotland was cited. He understood that in Scotland this had been an offence ever since 1757, or from an earlier date. The hon. and learned Member opposite, who had considerable experience of the law in Scotland, would perhaps agree that prosecutions for this offence in that country were exceedingly rare. He thought he was right in saying that only about twenty years ago did this cease to be a capital offence in Scotland, not that there had been many executions. In the debate to which he had referred, an hon. Member, who was a great authority on Scots law, said that prosecutions for this offence were practically unknown in Scotland. The Bill did not apply to Scotland, and he need not pursue that point further. There were certain details of the Bill which he did not think had been properly dealt with, and he would ask the House before passing a measure of this kind, having regard to the strong remarks of the two eminent lawyers who had sat on the opposite side of the House, and whose words he had quoted, to consider the whole subject carefully. Those distinguished lawyers raised the objection years ago that to make this a criminal offence would do more harm than good; and, however well intentioned the Bill might be, by bringing these matters into the light of the criminal Court, they would experience those consequences of publicity which were so well known to lawyers who attended criminal Courts. They should deal with the matter more by way of education than by extending the offence and making it criminal. He moved to omit Clause 1.

*MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford), in seconding the Amendment, said the subject was one which they did not wish to discuss at length. He seconded the Amendment for very similar reasons to those which had been advanced by his hon. and learned friend. There was a very large and increased demand among those lawyers who practised in the criminal Courts for a further consolidation of the criminal law, that it should be brought more up-to-date, and that various alterations and Amendments should be made in it. He thought that if they were going to create a new crime, the way to do it was not in a small Bill of this sort. Of course, if this offence were made a crime, no one could say otherwise than that the penalties which were provided in this clause were very moderate indeed, because no words could express the horror one had of this offence. He was very much afraid, however, that by making this a new crime, they were opening the door very wide to blackmailers, and to charges being brought against persons without proper foundation. They knew very well that in regard to an offence of a similar character, charges were brought by young girls which had no foundation whatever in fact. Relatives lived together under circumstances which no one questioned, but a charge of this sort might be brought and there would be, as they knew, the very greatest difficulty in furnishing any disproof. He thought that the Bill, if passed, would make the conditions of society in certain circumstances more dangerous than they were at the present moment. To create a new crime of this sort was very easy indeed, but where a charge was brought the difficulty of disproving it would be very great. It was for these reasons, and in the hope that nothing would be done until there was a general Amendment of the criminal law, that he seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the end of page 1, line 12, stand part of the Bill."

*MR. MACLEAN (Bath) said the grounds on which this Amendment had been moved were that they were creating a new crime, that there was no increase of this offence, and that there was a danger of blackmailing. But he thought the whole sense of the community was in favour of making this grave moral offence a crime. Out of every 1,000 people, 999 were under the impression that it was a crime, and most people would be astonished to hear that it was not. His professional experience had led him to know a good deal about this offence. No less than thirty-five cases, really of a most gross character, had come under his personal notice, within the last twelve months, and he had known instances producing no less than three or four children of weak intellect, idiots and imbeciles. The cases were of the most grave kind. The hon. Member who had moved the Amendment, perhaps, had not such a large experience as he possessed as to this crime, which was rife, he was sorry to say, in certain parts of the country, and there was a case for the Bill on sociological grounds. In Scotland it was less common, but it did occur, prosecutions were treated by the Press with great discretion, and punishment was meted out, with a beneficial result, in that country. As to blackmailing, that objection would apply to almost every kind of offence. He did not see any real danger arising from that cause, as was feared by the hon. Members opposite. In regard to the objection that they were creating a new crime by this Bill, he would point out that at one time this offence was a crime under the law of England. When the Puritans had sway over things in this country they made a long list of capital offences, which included adultery and incest. At the Restoration they swept away these penal offences, including that with which they were now dealing. It was a pure oversight, owing to what happened at the Restoration, that it was not a crime in England to-day.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cle land) said he desired on the part of t Home Office to say a few words support of the principle of the Bi The Home Office had been long awar from the reports they had received fro the police and other sources, that it was exceedingly necessary to add to the law provisions of the character proposed by this Bill. The hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University said the offence was probably less rife than it was in the past. He doubted whether anyone could say with any degree of certainty either that it was increasing or that it was decreasing, but it was quite certain that the offence was by no means rare, and it was essential that some steps should be taken by the Legislature to put a stop to it. It was not merely the case of a moral offence affecting grown-up people, but it might entail consequences of a disastrous kind on the offspring which sometimes followed from such intercourse, and from that point of view society had a special interest that should lead to steps being taken to put a stop to it. Nor was it the case that in Scotland the law was a dead letter. Every year there were a small number of convictions—on the average six each year—which showed that the law was necessary and that it could be put into force. So far from there being a danger, through this Bill, of persons being accused of the crime without being able to disprove it, he was afraid that, on the contrary, the danger would be found to be the great difficulty in proving the cases. But however difficult cases might be to prove, he hoped the House would agree that this offence should be regarded as a crime, and that the crime, when detected, ought to be punished.

*MR. REES said the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge had remarked that it was undesirable to make crimes of these immoral offences, and had used what was no doubt a strong argument as to blackmailing. But he would observe that the same argument applied to many other things. The deceased wife's sister was a case in point, and, if that argument had been allowed, they would never have passed the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Act. But the point to which he wished to refer was this: The hon. and learned Gentleman forgot that in India, which was under British law, the Courts treated adultery as a criminal offence, a fact which seemed very relevant to this discussion. He did not know that he was concerned with the ethics of that subject, but he remembered that one of the most learned Judges in India, a Brahmin, had discussed with him the fact that under the law in England that was treated as a civil offence which in India was made criminal; and the Judge had been sorry to have to explain the difference by saying that the leniency adopted in England towards so serious an offence as adultery was due to the exigencies of modern European society. He would, of course, himself, be sorry to adopt that view or to put it to the House, but he did submit that it was very relevant to the argument to point out that in our greatest dependency the course which the hon. and learned Member now deprecated was actually pursued, and the most conspicuous, and perhaps most common moral offence, was actually regarded in law as a crime.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he wanted a little more information. He did not wish to prevent the Bill from passing and from doing good. What he did not understand about it was whether it was intended as a deterrent or punishment. All the speeches made had been in favour of the measure, and he did not wish to say anything in opposition to it if it was necessary. All the speeches had been directed to proving that it was necessary to have punishment. That was contrary to the ideas of modern legislation. The infliction of punishment in these days was that it should act as a deterrent. But the point in reference to this Bill was that they might be rather increasing the evil than stopping it, and therefore he thought that they had not had from the Government or from anybody else a sufficient statement as to whether this offence was on the increase, and whether it was necessary to do something to stop it, or whether it was likely to be stopped in any way by this Bill. If the Bill would really act as a deterrent he thought that it would be a valuable addition to the law. But, as far as he could see, there had not been one word said as to that. It was perfectly true that if they made a man liable to three, five, or seven years penal servitude he was likely to avoid doing that which would involve the risk of such a punishment. He would like to hear a little more, however, as to the necessity for the Bill, and as to the probability of its being of some efficacy in preventing the commission of the crime against which it was directed.

MR. RAWLINSON said he wished to say one word in reply to the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs, who had put forward exactly the right argument that this offence was in precisely the same position as other moral offences, and that if they made this a crime it followed logically that they must make adultery a crime in England. The hon. Member quite fairly accepted that. He thought it a very dangerous question to start, certainly on a private Member's Bill at a late hour of a Friday afternoon. He did not think that they would find many English lawyers of position to support the argument that because adultery was a crime in India, where the circumstances were very different in many ways, therefore it ought to be a crime here. Did the House really think that a case had been made out for a change in the law, when, as had been pointed out, the charge would be exceedingly hard to prove, and when there would be most dangerous results where there was a case made out? He did not wish to detain the House, and, if the sense of the House was against him, he would not press his Amendment.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said he was surprised that they were asked to pass a Bill of this sort. Poor people were forced to live together, men and women often in the same room, and it was easy enough for anybody to make accusations which could not be disproved against parties who were totally innocent. They would make family life impossible if they passed such legislation. They would make it impossible for members of a family to live at home without running the risk of terrible accusations being brought against them. They all knew how convictions were brought about. Persons went into the witness box and swore what they said was true, and the jury were advised if they believed them to convict the prisoner. Nobody, however, could go into the witness box and disprove accusations of this description. An accused might kiss the Book, and swear he did not do it, but, of course, his evidence would be useless, whilst the evidence of the person who said he did it would stand good. It would be only necessary for some malicious person to get up and swear falsely, and the accused would be sentenced to seven years penal servitude. He thought they might take advice from the fact that their ancestors had refrained from passing legislation of this kind. Once they began with this class of legislation, they must go on, and what would happen to humanity if people were to be open to accusations of crimes which they could not possibly disprove? None of the parties to the alleged offence might make any complaint, and yet some third party might come forward and complain. It was contrary to all principles of the law to make this a criminal offence. Arguments had been used against it by men in the highest position and of the greatest repute; and he asked the House to pause before they tried to make the world good by legislation passed in a headlong rush. They might thrash and imprison people, but they would not make them good. There were appointed ways of dealing with immorality, and that was to try and lead people kindly by preaching religion and morality to them. When they left that path, which on the whole had answered so well, and had made us a great, a glorious, and a good nation, when they turned aside from the assistance of the clergy, the schoolmaster, and all the ladies and gentlemen who went about doing good, and simply relied upon the policeman, then they took the wrong course, and would make the world not better, but he was afraid very much worse.

Amendment negatived.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir S. EVANS, Glamorganshire, Mid.) said there was an Amendment on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for the Kingston Division of Surrey. He had spoken to his hon. friend about it, and he begged to accept it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, after the word 'is,' to insert the words 'alleged in the indictment.'"—(*Sir Samuel Evans.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

SIR SAMUEL EVANS said there was another Amendment in the name of the hon. Member for Kingston, which, after consultation with him, had been accepted in a slightly different form. He begged to move, accordingly, in page 1, line 29, to leave out all after the word 'over' down to the end of line 3 on page 2, and insert 'such female; and, if the offender is the guardian of such female, to remove the offender from such guardianship, and in any such case to appoint any person or persons to be the guardian or guardians of such female during her minority or any less period." The House would see that the effect of that would be that upon conviction for an offence under the Act against a female with regard to whom the person convicted was a guardian, he could be removed from his position of guardian or any position of authority, and the Court would appoint some other person in his place.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 29, to leave out all words after the word ' over ' down to the end of line 3, on page 2, in order to insert the words ' such female; and, if the offender is the guardian of such female, to remove the offender from such guardianship and in any such case to appoint any person or persons to be the guardian or guardians of such female during her minority or any less period.' "—(*Sir Samuel Evans.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill, put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Mr. RAWLINSON moved the omission of Clause 4. It was, he said, a very exceptional class of crime where a wife was made to give evidence against her husband or a husband against his wife; and he certainly thought that if the Bill was to be passed this clause ought to be sacrificed. It was making the Bill much too strong to make it compulsory for a wife to give evidence against her husband.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, to leave out Clause 4."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Amendment negatived.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

And, it being Five of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Friday next.

POLLING DISTRICTS AND REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) moved a new clause. (Alteration in method of compiling register.)

Proposed new clause—

"Any county council in Ireland may with the sanction of the Local Government Board for Ireland arrange to have the register of voters or any part of the register, prepared alphabetically in townlands or, as regards urban districts, in streets,"—(*Mr. J. MacVeagh,*)—

Brought up, and read the first and second time, and added to the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 14 and 15, to leave out the words ' within the meaning of the Redistribution of Seats Act, 1885,' and to insert the words ' or parliamentary division thereof.' "—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 9, at the end, to insert the words ' (1) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may make rules for adapting to the provisions of this Act the enactments relating to the registration of electors in Ireland and the precepts and forms contained in or used under those enactments.' "—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.) objected.

MR. J. MACVEAGH appealed to the Attorney-General to say whether the new subsection was essential. If it was not, he hoped he would drop it so that the Bill might go through.

MR. CHERRY said the object of it was to bring the Bill into harmony with the general scheme of registration. Unless the Lord-Lieutenant were given the power to deal with these rules, there would be two authorities dealing with the subject.

MR. MOORE said the hon. Gentleman had refused to apply the Bill to towns.

MR. CHERRY said the hon. Member was mistaken. An Amendment had been made on the Motion of the hon. Member for South Down.

MR. MOORE said that if the hon. Gentleman would put it off for a week they would consider it; they objected now.

MR. J. MACVEAGH appealed to the hon. Member to withdraw his objection.

MR. MOORE said he had received an objection from the registration officer in his division, and until that was met he must object.

Objection being taken to further Proceeding, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY COUNCILS) BILL.

Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be read the third time upon Friday next.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A. (in respect of the Access to Mountains Bill): Viscount Castlereagh; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. O'Neill.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B. (in respect of the Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill): Viscount Castlereagh; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Claude Hay.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C. (in respect of the Post Office Savings Bank Bill): Mr. Brotherton, Mr. Watson Rutherford, and Mr. Starkey; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Lord Balcarres, Mr. Courthope, and Mr. Staveley-Hill.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C. (in respect of the Prevention of Crime Bill): Mr. Rawlinson; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Staveley-Hill.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at nine minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 29th June, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Law Guarantee Trust and Accident and United Legal Indemnity Insurance Societies Bill [H.L.].—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the Promotors do not intend to proceed further with the Bill: Order for the Second Reading To-morrow discharged: Ordered, that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3.) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Swinton and Mexbrough Gas Bill.—Reported, with Amendments.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill, Manchester Corporation Bill, Widnes Corporation Bill, Tyne Improvement Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 25th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly, and committed; the Committees to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Leith Burgh Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Leicester Corporation Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Bromley and Crays Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Cardiff Railway Bill [H.L.]; King's College, London (Transfer) Bill [H.L.]; Audenshaw Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. — Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Swansea Valley Gas Bill [H.L.], now Tawe Valley Gas Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.]; Post Office Consolidation Bill [H.L.]; Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.].—Message from the Commons that they have appointed a Committee to consist of Seven Members to join with the Committee appointed by this House, and to request this House to add two Lords to the Joint Committee. The said Message to be considered on Wednesday next.

Board of Trade (Provisional Orders) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to enable rules to be made regulating the procedure with respect to Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under certain Acts of Parliament, and for other matters incidental thereto. Was presented by the Lord Hamilton of Dalzell; read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 113.)

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been read 2ª (The Lord Denman for the Lord Herschell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 116.)

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11) Bill. (No. 117.); Marriages Provisional Order Bill. (No. 118.)—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), with the Amendments, and passed and returned to the Commons.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LUNACY.

Sixty-second Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy, 1908.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4031. China (Kiukiang).

NATIONAL GUARANTEE FOR THE WAR RISKS OF SHIPPING.

Report to the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury of the Committee appointed to consider a national guarantee for the war risks of shipping; with minutes of evidence and appendices.

INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1908–9).

Explanatory Memorandum by the Under-Secretary of State for India.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of August, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).

Regulations, dated 20th June, 1908, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 79 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the process of the casting of brass; Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE (MERCANTILE CORPORATIONS AND COMPANIES) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to confer the municipal franchise upon Mercantile Corporations and Companies, and to amend the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882—was presented by the Lord Avebury; read 1ª; to be printed, and to be read 2ª on Tuesday, the 14th of July next. (No. 112.)

TOBACCO GROWING SCOTLAND BILL (No. 114).

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (ADMISSION OF THE PRESS) BILL. (No. 115.)

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed.

TREATMENT OF MERCHANT SEAMEN.

LORD MUSKERRY rose to call the attention of His Majesty's Government to the Return issued recently in response to an Order of this House agreed to on 28th May, 1906, showing the legal obligations of the owners of merchant vessels trading under the flags of Germany, France, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Russia, Denmark, Austro-Hungary, Netherlands, Greece, and Belgium, towards their captains, officers, and seamen with regard to the following:—Old-age pensions, pensions to widows and orphans, accident compensation, Sunday labour, daily hours of labour at sea and in port, payment for work performed in excess of fixed hours of labour, medical treatment, accommodation, and passages of distressed seamen; also including in such a Return the regulations of these different countries for the preservation of discipline on board their merchant ships; to ask whether His Majesty's Government will consider the desirability of issuing a similar Return at periodic intervals of, say, five years; whether they will take into consideration the necessity for amelioration of the conditions of captains, officers, and seamen of British ships on lines similar to those already provided by certain foreign maritime Powers in the direction of the preservation of discipline on board ship, Sunday labour, daily hours of labour, and payment for extra work required beyond the ordinary recognised hours of labour; and, further, to ask the reason of the long delay in issuing the Return under notice.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I think the simplest course is for me to deal first with the last part of my Notice—namely, my inquiry as to why it has taken such an undue length of time to issue this Return, which was agreed to by your Lordships as far back as 28th May, 1906. I am not complaining that the Foreign Office were not reasonably prompt in communicating with His Majesty's representatives abroad asking for the necessary information for framing this Return. This request was made by the Foreign Office on the 18th June, 1906. His Majesty's representative at Vienna furnished the necessary information in connection with Austrian ships after a space of about five months. But it took the British Consul-General at Buda Pesth over twelve months to furnish the

Ambassador at Vienna with similar information regarding Hungarian vessels, and even then his report only embraces a couple of pages.

The various Reports were, I presume, forwarded to the Board of Trade, as the Return is dated "Board of Trade, January, 1908." It was not, however, ordered to be printed until February 17th following, and it was not until towards the end of April that it was issued for your Lordship's information. To be of any value, and to justify the trouble and expense incurred in issuing a Return of this kind, your Lordships will, I think, agree with me that it should be issued with the utmost promptitude, and contain the latest and fullest information possible. If a modest Return of this kind occupies nearly two years in preparation, it is time some inquiry was made into the lax methods which prevail by which Parliamentary Returns may undoubtedly lose the greater part of their value.

What the shipping world thinks of the belated nature of this Return will be found in a leading article appearing in the leading daily shipping paper printed in this country. I refer to the *Shipping Gazette*, which says that—

> "When we find a publication of this description thrown at the heads of the House of Lords and the public in a fashion which would disgrace a struggling country-newspaper, the question naturally arises whether it is not possible to introduce some improvements in the method of Foreign Office Reports."

I will not pursue this matter further, but I hope we shall get some satisfactory assurance that future Returns moved for and agreed to in this House will be dealt with in a much more expeditious and satisfactory way.

Coming to the contents of the Return itself, I venture to think that, despite the delay I have referred to, your Lordships may glean from it some most interesting and valuable information. It is a practical endorsement of my own convictions and of contentions oft-times expressed by me in this House, that, in many respects, foreign maritime countries treat and consider their sailors far better than we do in this country. I find from the Return that, although the British shipowner so bitterly complains of cheap foreign competition, it is the foreign shipowners, in certain particulars, who make much better provisions for those who serve in their ships, and who are labouring under legal obligations towards their seamen from which British shipowners are immune. Whilst we, in this country, have apparently less regard for our sailors than for any other class of the community—principally, I suppose, because we make no provision in order that sailors may exercise their franchise—I find that other maritime countries appear to take the interest of their seamen into special regard, and do not allow them to be treated in anything but a just, proper, and reasonable way.

If a Bill which is before the present Parliament succeeds, I presume that we shall not exclude our sailors from the provision which grants a pension of 5s. a week at the age of seventy. Assuming that the Bill does succeed, it will be interesting to find how many seamen reach the age of seventy in proportion to those who follow their occupation ashore. I think the strain upon the public funds in granting pensions to seamen will not be likely to be a source of much anxiety to His Majesty's Government. Other maritime Powers have already set us an example which we might well follow in respect to their treatment of seamen in their declining years, and in respect also to widows and orphans whom they may leave behind.

In Austria I find there is a charitable fund, which is officially administered, for the relief of old or disabled officers and seamen and their widows and orphans. This fund, which is principally supported by voluntary contributions, amounted at the end of last year to approximately £89,000, and at the present time is granting relief to 1,386 persons. The Austrian Lloyd Steamship Company, the largest company of its kind in Austria, compels all its men drawing £24 a year or over to pay a subscription of 3 per cent. of wages for single, and 5 per cent. for married men. From these subscriptions a fund is provided ensuring its members and their widows a small pension. In Belgium, owners of merchant ships must pay to the Seamen's Benevolent Fund 1½ per cent. of the total amount expended on wages of all the seamen they employ, whilst all officers, seamen, and others must subscribe to the fund 3 per cent. or 4 per cent. of their wages according to rank. Out of this fund pensions of from £9 to £30 are granted in case of inability to work on account of old age, or on account of an accident met with whilst in the exercise of their calling. Widows of seamen who are members of the Benevolent Institution receive pensions varying from £9 to £24, and an additional sum of from £2 to £3 for every child under eighteen years of age.

In Denmark there are no legal obligations on shipowners in respect of pensions, but the United Steamship Company, which possesses 125 steamships, has established a pension fund. Whilst their captains, officers, and seamen pay towards it 6 per cent. per annum from their wages, the company double the amount paid in. Out of the fund thus raised pensions are paid to captains, officers, and seamen in their old age, and to their widows and children. On reaching sixty years of age seamen are, in the same way as all other Danish subjects, entitled to old-age relief under the Danish law.

It is hardly necessary or desirable for me to take up your Lordships' time in going into further particulars so far as they affect seamen's pensions existing in other maritime countries. It is sufficient to say that old-age pensions and allowances towards captains, officers, and seamen, and to their widows and orphans, exist in France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy and Sweden. Of course, there are certain specified conditions laid down in each country in respect to these pensions. The manner in which the necessary funds are usually raised is by enforcing contributions from the shipowners and the seamen, and from sources such, for instance, as fines which have been imposed in connection with offences on board ship.

Turning from pensions to another subject, we heard a great outcry against the extension of the Workmen's Compensation Act to seamen. Our shipowners complained that it was a very unfair burden to impose upon them. especially in view of the foreign competition with which they had to contend. On looking over the present Return, I find that other leading maritime countries have for a long time recognised the justice of a seaman's claim upon his owner after injury sustained in the course of his employment. In Austria, a charitable fund, under official control, exists for the relief of disabled officers and seamen. In Hungary similar provision is made. In Denmark, an Act of Parliament concerning the insurance of sailors against accidents came into force on 15th January, 1906. Other maritime countries where seamen are bound to fall back on their own slender recources in the case of injury in course of their employment are France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Russia, and Sweden.

So far as the British mercantile marine is concerned, we have always been proud to claim that it was in the van of shipping progress. From a pecuniary point of view, or from the improvements in our ships, this may be so. But it has been very mistaken pride in so far as the treatment of those who man our ships is concerned. In their case the Return which I have commented upon seems to clearly indicate that our pride is not justified. On the question of hours of labour, there is nothing in law which prevents the British shipowner from working his seafaring employees in a most unreasonable way. I do not say that he does so knowingly or deliberately; but, owing to the strenuous way in which British shipping business is carried on, and to very limited crews, there is no doubt about the overwork that goes on.

Officers, after attending to the loading of their ships all day, must go on the bridge at night-time to keep watch whilst the vessel is steaming to her next port. Eighteen hours' continuous attention to duty is an experience well known to merchant service officers. The ordinary British sailor works, week in and week out, day after day, at the very least twelve hours per diem. Saturday and Sunday make no real difference in the case of either officers or seamen. When we take these matters into consideration, in conjunction with other hardships with which our sailors have to contend, we can hardly marvel at the discontent prevalent amongst the officers, and the insubordination which exists amongst the crews of British ships.

What do other maritime countries show us this respect? Though there are no legal restrictions upon them to do so, the Austrian Lloyd Steamship Company, which, as I have said, is the largest company of its kind in Austria, prescribes special hours of labour, both at sea and in port, as well as on Sundays and special holidays. Special payment is also granted for work in excess of these fixed hours. In Hungary, I notice from the Return that the regulations of Hungarian shipping companies prescribe hours of overtime in a similar way. In Denmark, the law, I find, is that in case the master finds it necessary, in emergencies, to let the crew work at loading or discharging on Sundays and Danish holidays—which clearly implies that it is not to be imagined that they should be expected to work on Sundays except under very exceptional conditions—then any member participating in such work shall, if nothing else is agreed upon, receive extra pay of half a day's wages for each two hours over and above working hours, or fractions thereof. Though it is not mentioned in the Return I understand that the French Government have, of late, adopted legislation which will prevent Sunday labour on board their ships except under special conditions.

In Germany, the law is that so long as a ship is in harbour or lying in a roadstead, service may only be demanded on Sundays and holidays as far as is absolutely necessary and incapable of postponement. The ship's crew may not be employed in any case in loading or unloading a cargo within the Imperial territory—not even with their own consent. On Sundays and holidays only absolutely necessary work may be demanded from the crew whilst the ship is on a voyage. The German holidays must be kept on board ship just as they are on shore, and an owner or captain, should he by his order disobey the regulations respecting Sunday work, is liable to a heavy fine. When German ships are in harbour, or in a roadstead, a seaman, except in pressing cases, is only allowed to work ten hours daily, and in the tropics only eight hours. Whilst this does not apply to the captain, the officers can demand a period of eight hours rest during every twenty-four hours whilst a ship is in harbour or lying in a roadstead. Overtime performed in excess of the recognised hours on German ships must be paid for whether a man has done the work voluntarily or upon being compelled to do so.

According to the Return, it seems probable that Italy will adopt legislation fixing eight hours a day for the engine department and twelve hours for deck hands, any overtime to be paid at no less than one-eighth of the day's salary per hour. Working hours when in harbour are to be eight, whilst Sundays and holidays must be observed, unless there are very exceptional circumstances arising which prevent it. If the work is required, then it must be paid for. In Norway, the State officially supervises the hours during which seamen work. If a man has worked for eighteen hours or more, he shall have at least eight hours' rest, and on the departure of a ship the captain must see that the sailors who are on duty during the first watch have had opportunity of becoming sufficiently rested. Norway also imposes limitations on Sunday and holiday labour, and officers must be paid for overtime. In Russia, Sunday labour is not compulsory, whether at sea or in port, except in cases of absolute necessity. As a rule the working day is fixed at ten hours, and any work performed in excess is paid for extra. In Spain, Sunday rest is observed, although no law exists applying to it. If there is work to be done in port on Sundays or holidays a permit is applied for to the ecclesiastical authority at the port, and it is said that it is usually granted. In Sweden, it is enacted that the master of a ship shall not on Sunday, or any other days kept holy in the Kingdom of Sweden, impose on the crew any work which can be postponed.

Whilst it is not easy to draw a hard and fast scale of hours of labour on board ship, it is but just to our own officers and the seamen that there should be legal limitations. They should have reasonable opportunity for rest, and, if they are compelled to work beyond reasonable hours, they should be compensated for it. This is a matter which should be made obligatory by the Government. Also, we should take special precaution that the officers of merchant ships, who require to exercise so much care and vigilance for the safety of their ships and of life at sea, should be able to obtain adequate daily rest. This they most certainly do not get in those ships, and they form the great majority, where the pernicious two-watch—four hours on and four hours off—system is carried on.

As to Sunday labour on board British ships, which has now become quite a usual occurrence in ports both at home and abroad, it is a stain on our flag that we should allow such a practice to continue. We profess to be a religious and God-fearing nation; we wrangle and dispute over such matters as the religious education of the young, and other questions affecting religion. Yet although this is essentially a non-sectarian question and easy of solution, we leave it severely alone. It is an elementary basis of all religions that proper opportunity should be given for religious worship and for the due observance of the Sabbath. Yet the unfortunate officers and seamen of our country but very rarely know the joys of one day's rest in seven, much less have the opportunity of paying their devotions on the Sabbath. These are the men who demand first consideration. They are tied to their posts for weeks and months on end, and, after all, it is our merchant service which is the life blood of our nation.

I will not dwell on this matter further, as I hope, with the indulgence of your Lordships, to bring it forward in a more direct way, when perhaps you will give your assistance in removing a great and unquestionable evil. There are many other matters in this Return worthy of the attention of this House, but I do not wish to trespass on your Lordships' forbearance, and will refer to one more subject only before concluding. Though I have left it to the end, it is none the less of enormous importance. In this matter I speak in the interests of British shipowners even more than in the interests of those who are responsible for discipline on merchant ships. What British shipowners lose through the insubordination of seamen and firemen on British ships it would be impossible to estimate. Their ships are delayed; they are in consequence subjected to endless expense and trouble, and the insubordination existing in the mercantile marine presents one of the greatest hindrances to the remarkable enterprise which has invariably been shown by our shipowners.

The Imperial Merchant Service Guild, the recognised body representing the captains and officers of the merchant service, have informed me that this is a subject which is eating at the very vitals of the service, and one need not feel surprised at this when we have it from Board of Trade figures that during last year no fewer than 14,000 men who had signed articles agreeing to serve in their ships failed to join. Imagine the delay, trouble, and expense thus caused, and the composition of the crews of many British ships compelled to take anything they could get at the last moment in order to make up their complement and put to sea. Then, again, the late President of the Board of Trade told us, not very long ago, that there had been 27,000 desertions from British ships in one year. These figures alone are appalling, yet they do not by any means disclose the whole situation. Insubordination and defiance of authority go on even more than ever, and if we do not endeavour to put a stop to this we shall suffer for it later on. Whilst I am a firm believer in the utmost consideration being shown to seamen or firemen, I am still a more firm believer in placing in the hands of their superiors some real authority that will enable them to preserve that effective discipline which is essential in every walk of life, and particularly so on board ship.

The chief secret of the efficiency of the Royal Navy is not so much its armaments, or its number of ships, but the men who serve in it, and the stern discipline which is maintained. In the merchant service, if a man uses insulting language to a superior officer, he may be fined 5s. In the Royal Navy he would probably be imprisoned for twelve months for a similar offence. A personal assault on a commander or officer of a merchant ship usually means prosecution of the offender in a police court, and he generally escapes with a punishment of possibly seven or fourteen days imprisonment, or, in some cases, the infliction of a fine of 20s. or 40s. and costs. We know what the result would be for an offence of this kind in the Royal Navy. Or even if we look at the example of Swedish merchant ships, we find that an offence of this kind is punishable by penal servitude not exceeding two years or by imprisonment.

It is evident from the Return that the ships of foreign maritime countries have far more satisfactory and effective means at their disposal for the preservation of discipline, and this accounts for the fact that it is so rarely that we ever hear of trouble amongst crews of foreign ships. I believe that the Shipping Federation endeavour, so far as they can, to prosecute delinquents on British ships, but they find it an extremely difficult matter to deal with owing to the defective means at their disposal. It is not right, however, that the settlement of this serious national evil should be saddled upon British shipowners. I would earnestly submit that it is only by legislation and by a very strong attitude on the part of the Board of Trade that a remedy can be effected.

Foreign countries recognise that abuse of disciplinary powers should be looked upon very seriously, and this is a proviso which I myself would strongly support. Were there salutary means at hand to stop insubordination, we should find that it would be checked automatically, and it would be very seldom necessary to have recourse to the more severe forms of punishment which might be available. In place of endless trouble and discontent we should find rest and quiet, and the lot of the men themselves would be so improved as to attract boys to the sea. This would go far, in the end, to solve the problem of the manning of the mercantile marine. The efficiency and paramountcy of the Royal Navy has been very much to the fore of late, but it should not be forgotten that without our merchant service we should very quickly take a back seat amongst continental or even other Powers.

Whilst it is our duty to ensure the efficiency of the Royal Navy, it is equally the duty of our nation to ensure the efficiency of our merchant service. If we do nothing to encourage and support the British shipowner or to improve and put right the material conditions of our officers and seamen, our unpardonable sin of omission in these respects and neglect of the true interests of the country will find us out sooner or later. I trust therefore, that your Lordships will take into serious consideration the national character of the merchant service and support any measures which may be taken to improve it, thus enabling it to withstand the fierce and rapidly-growing competition which is presented by the merchant services of other nations.

THE LORD BISHOP OF BANGOR, who had the following notice on the Paper—To ask His Majesty's Government whether they will obtain a return from His Majesty's Consuls at San Francisco, Portland (Oregon), Rio de Janeiro, Valparaiso, Rosario, Nagasaki, Sydney, and Newcastle, of the number of desertions from British merchant sailing vessels, which took place in their respective ports in the year ending 1st June, 1908, and in the three preceding years, stating the percentage on the total number of seamen visiting the port.—said: My Lords, as I wish to support generally what Lord Muskerry has said in his interesting speech, it may save the time of the House if I am allowed to put my Question as a kind of rider to the Questions of Lord Muskerry. I am, of course, in the hands of your Lordships, but I think this would be the better course, as I do not think my Question requires more than a simple answer "Yes" or "No." It would, I think, be interesting to know whether the Act passed by His Majesty's Government a year or two ago has answered its expectations and succeeding in reducing the number of desertions among seamen. In accordance with a Return moved for in the House of Commons when Lord Salisbury was in power, sixteen authorities sent in very interesting reports dealing with the causes of desertion, and I ask in my Question that some at least of these authorities should be communicated with in order to learn whether the Act has been successful in removing the causes and in reducing the number of desertions.

I may say that I have been told, not by any member of His Majesty's Government but unofficially, that the answer is likely to be such as we all desire. It is true that no amelioration in the conditions under which seamen work would altogether abolish desertions, but it would be a great tribute to that Act if it could be shown that increased conditions of comfort for seamen had tended to lessen desertions. That is simply my Question, except that instead of saying "consuls" with regard to those two ports in our own dominions, I ought to have said "the Colonial authorities." Speaking generally, I should like to associate myself with the purport of the speech of my noble friend opposite. I think that the class for whom we plead have special claims upon your Lordships; and for this reason. These men have no one to champion their interests in the other House, they have no powerful union, and practically no political power behind them. I am aware that there is a seamen's and firemen's union, but that organisation does not trouble itself much about the class of men whose grievances are named in the consular reports to which I refer. In this respect, therefore, these men should be the special objects of the protection of your Lordships. When the Merchant Shipping Act was passing through this House I moved a small Amendment to the effect that a man after four months hard work and on arriving at a foreign port might be able to draw a small portion of the wages he had earned instead of waiting for another five or six months until he returned home. But that request was refused by His Majesty's Government. I ask whether that Amendment would not have been treated with much more respect if these men had had a powerful union behind them.

There is another question of very great difficulty, which, I think, appeals to your Lordships in your judicial capacity. It is a very difficult one, for this reason. We who take an interest in this subject know that the profits of the shipowners are not excessive, and that if any step were taken which would render it impossible for shipowners to carry on their trade a very ill service would have been done to the men for whom I speak, and a greater ill service to the whole commonwealth. That, I think, is plain. Again, those noble Lords who speak for the shipowners in this House come here with very clean hands and easy consciences, because the lines with which they are connected are managed in such a generous, fair, and humane spirit that employment in those lines is very eagerly sought by merchant seamen.

But very hard cases do exist. There are the cases especially of those seamen who go for long voyages round Cape Horn in sailing ships, and who especially require the protection of the Government. I was just looking at this Return and I noticed the case of a ship which, after a four months voyage from Cardiff, arrived at Nagasaki. The captain kept the ship anchored half a mile from shore, and the men were compelled to work for a month in the broiling sun without any protection and without leave to go ashore. May I ask whether the sweating in the east end of London, of which we hear so much, presents any worse features? There are, of course, cases where the strong competition renders it difficult for a shipowner not to work his men during the Sunday; but, while there are those cases, there are many others where rest might be afforded. It is for these reasons that I venture to support what my noble friend opposite has said and to express the hope that your Lordships, and especially His Majesty's Government, will extend to the case of these sailors, many of whom are absolutely friendless and have no power of any kind behind them, that protection which your Lordships' House is ever ready to give.

Lord ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I think it matter for regret that the Return which was moved for by my noble friend was not laid before both Houses of Parliament much earlier. It was asked for in May, 1906, and if it had been presented in six months' time it would probably have had a considerable effect in the negotiations and the eventual compromise which took place before the Merchant Shipping Bill was allowed to go through in another place. I do not say that all the replies could have been sent in within that time, but a good deal of the information could have been collected. I hope that His Majesty's Government will be able to accede to what I consider the reasonable request of Lord Muskerry, that every five years a similar document should be published. But I would also ask that, regardless of any stated period, whenever any rival nation makes any considerable or important alterations in its maritime laws, a document embodying those alterations should be laid before both Houses without delay, so that when the Merchant Shipping Act comes up again for revision our legislators will have fuller information than they had before them in the year 1906.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, the Return which is the subject of the original Question was a very comprehensive and elaborate one. It had to show the legal obligations of the owners of merchant vessels under the flags of Germany, France, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Russia, Denmark, Austria, Hungary, the Netherlands, Greece, and Belgium towards the captains, officers, and seamen of their mercantile marine in regard to a great number of matters; and your Lordships will understand that a Return of that kind must necessarily occupy a considerable time in its compilation.

The process which has to be gone through, of course, is that the Board of Trade communicates with the Foreign Office. The Foreign Office, in turn, communicates with His Majesty's representatives in those various countries. They collect the information, which returns through the same channel, and, if everything goes absolutely right and there is no hitch in the matter at all, it is inevitable that a considerable time should be occupied in the preparation of such a Return. Unfortunately, in this case there was a hitch, because the Return which came from one of the countries—from Hungary—was not exactly an answer to the questions which had been asked, and it was, therefore, necessary that that process should be repeated in the case of that country. The result of all this was that the complete replies were not in the hands of the Department until the autumn of last year. They were then put into shape and were laid before the House at the commencement of this session. I quite agree that the noble Lord has cause for complaint at the time which has elapsed since the Return was ordered, and I can only express great regret that it was not issued sooner. I can, however, assure him that it was not delayed from any desire to suppress or burke the information which it contained. The delay really arose from a desire that the Return should be issued in a complete and comprehensive form.

Then the noble Lord asks whether His Majesty's Government will consider the desirability of issuing a similar Return every five years. Of course, we are in the hands of the House with regard to that matter, but it is not thought desirable to multiply unnecessarily the number of these periodical Returns. Their preparation causes an enormous amount of trouble, and in this case it has entailed considerable expense; and it is thought that, except in cases where it is really necessary, it is better that the Returns should be moved for when they are thought to be wanted. As I say, we are, of course, in the hands of the House in this matter; but I would suggest to the noble Lord that the better course would be that if in four or five years time he considers that such a Return should again be made he should make a Motion to that effect, when I am quite sure that whatever Government may be in office at that time will be only too glad to accede to the request.

Next the noble Lord asks whether His Majesty's Government will take into consideration the necessity for amelioration of the conditions of captains, officers, and seamen of British ships on lines similar to those already provided by certain foreign maritime Powers in various directions, amongst others in the direction of the preservation of discipline on board ship. It is a little difficult to imagine what measures might be concerted for the preservation of discipline, which would be considered to be for the amelioration of the conditions of each of these three classes. Captains of ships might conceivably think that their condition would be ameliorated if they were given additional powers of discipline over the officers and men composing their crew, but it is not so clear that that view would be shared by the other two classes. I would say, generally, that this matter of discipline was very extensively discussed and dealt with to a considerable extent in the Merchant Shipping Act of 1906. That Act has not very long been in force, and it would seem that it would be better to give it a chance to see how it works before introducing any further legislation.

The noble Lord went on to ask whether similar measures will be taken in regard to Sunday labour, daily hours of labour, and payment for extra work required beyond the ordinary recognised hours of labour. Those questions present very great difficulties. The conditions under which the merchant shipping of this country is conducted vary so enormously, that industry being carried on in every part of the globe, that it is very difficult to frame any rules capable of universal application; and up to now it has been thought better that these matters should be arranged between the employers and the employed. I know that certain countries have dealt with these matters, but I think that a study of the Return will show that the regulations which have been made have not been very stringent. They allow of a great number of exceptions, and they are more in the direction, you might say, of advice than of actual command.

I may also say that this question of hours of labour is very intimately connected with the question of manning, because it is obvious that where a ship is under-manned it is a great deal more likely that the crew will be called upon to work unduly long hours than would be the case where a full complement is carried. This question of manning is now under the consideration of the Advisory Committee of the Board of Trade, and I am sure that my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade will welcome any suggestions which one so intimately connected with the industry as the noble Lord may have to make on the subject. I think I have answered generally the Questions put to me by the noble Lord. I think the House intimated that they wished me also to answer the Question of the right rev. Prelate now. I can do so in a few words. We have not at present the necessary figures and data to give the answer for which he asks, but we will endeavour to obtain them and will lay the result on the Table as early as possible.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: My Lords, the concluding remarks of the noble Lord who has just sat down are, no doubt, fully justified. It is too early yet to draw any very safe conclusions from the working of the last Act. But I think the noble Lord will agree that the request of the right rev. Prelate was a very reasonable and modest one—namely, that these matters should engage the careful attention of the Government so that any amelioration in the lot of the seaman which is advisable and possible might be carried into effect.

The noble Lord was in the position of many Ministers in having to apologise for the great delay in the presentation of the Return. I am quite sure the House does not think that he himself is in any degree personally responsible for that delay, but, undoubtedly, the delay was a very great one. It was due really to a very well known cause —that it was a Blue-book prepared, not by one Department, but by two. When that is the case the correspondence and communications which pass between the two Departments have a tendency to be almost indefinitely prolonged, unless pressure is applied by the responsible Ministers at the head of the Departments in order to produce a rather quicker pace. I think it is just those Returns that require the closest watching on the part of Ministers lest they should disappear altogether in these endless communications.

I was a little sorry that the noble Lord held out no hope that these Returns would be kept up to date. The noble Lord's reply was that this was an inadvisable request. I do not think it was an inadvisable request, or one that it would be difficult for His Majesty's Government to comply with. All that is really required is that an instruction should be given to the Consuls and representatives of His Majesty's Government abroad that in the course of the annual Reports which they make to the Home Government these particular matters should not be lost sight of; and all that the noble Lord has to do is to move down to the end of the Ministerial Bench to where the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs sits and suggest to him that a general instruction should be sent to His Majesty's representatives abroad that any change in the conditions of the merchant service of those countries should be notified to His Majesty's Government. Then all the information would be available in England, and it would be merely a matter of a few hours work on the part of a clerk in the Department to put it together so that it could be laid before Parliament as often as may seem good. I, therefore, think my noble friend will find on inquiry that the request is not a difficult one, and that the matter might easily be arranged between himself and the Foreign Office and, to some extent, of course, the Colonial Office.

With regard to discipline, may I say I think the noble Lord misconceived the nature of the inquiry which my noble friend made to the Government on that subject, and the effect which complying with his request would have; because he seemed to think that to increase the powers of discipline in the merchant service might be for the advantage of the masters or of the officers but could not be for the advantage of the men.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: I said the men might not agree.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: It is not asked that the noble Lord should take a plebiscite of the views of masters, officers, and men in order to come to an agreement. The promotion of good discipline on board ship is not only good for one class; it is good for everybody concerned. Therefore, it would not be at all correct to suppose that, in urging that this question of discipline should be considered, my noble friend was advocating the interests of one class of those engaged in the merchant service rather than another. The truth is that the more we can improve the conditions of the merchant service the better it will be for everybody all round.

And that brings me to the heart of the question. The real difficulty is the one which was referred to by the right rev. Prelate. Owing to the very small margin of profit at the disposal of many of those engaged in the merchant service, it would not be for the benefit of that service, or those concerned in it, if unduly heavy obligations were imposed. At the same time, the more the conditions can be improved within those limits the better it will be for the men and for the country at large. It is of the most vital importance that we should keep the merchant service popular in this country. There have been symptoms that its popularity is waning, and that we are inclining to become less of a seafaring nation than we used to be. Such a change would be very disastrous, and anything in reason which can be done to prevent it ought to receive careful consideration. Therefore, I venture, with great respect, to add my voice to the request which has been made by my noble friend behind me, and by the right rev. Prelate, that all these matters should be kept continually before the Board of Trade, and His Majesty's Government. The more information we can get as to what is done in foreign countries the better it will be for us, and the more able shall we be to form a just conclusion on the subject.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord FITZMAURICE): My Lords, this is mainly a Board of Trade question, but I would ask your Lordships' permission to say one or two words in regard to what fell from the noble Lord who introduced this subject, and from my noble friend opposite as to the position of the Foreign Office in the matter. In the absence of further proof, I cannot plead guilty, on behalf of the Foreign Office or of the Board of Trade, to there having been any delay in the real sense of the term. Nor do I admit what my noble friend Lord Salisbury said just now, that, granting delay, the excuse was to be found in the fact that this was a complicated Return in which two, if not three, Departments were concerned.

I quite agree—indeed it is obvious—that where a Return does affect two or three offices, the operation of getting it must be a longer one; but if noble Lords will look at the nature of this Return they will see over what an immense field it travelled, and how absolutely necessary it was, if the Return was to be worth anything and to be accurate—and if it was not it obviously would be worth nothing—that the information should be obtained in a full and accurate shape. The subjects dealt with were old-age pensions, pensions to widows and orphans, accident compensation, Sunday labour, daily hours of labour at sea and in port, payment for work performed in excess of fixed hours of labour, medical treatment, accommodation, and passages of distressed seamen, and also the regulations for the preservation of discipline on board their merchant ships. The nations concerned were Germany, France, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Russia, Denmark, Austria-Hungary, the Netherlands, Greece, and Belgium. I venture to think that that is a very large and extensive field of inquiry. Of course, if our Consular officers only had this Return to prepare, they could have done it more quickly; but the staff abroad is not a large one for the enormous work they have to perform, and it was their desire to present a Return which would be completely satisfactory to your Lordships. Bearing these facts in mind, I do not think there is any real ground for complaint. At the same time I shall be quite willing to inquire into the circumstances; and in regard to the further appeal that was made by my noble friend who spoke just now that these facts should be borne in mind year by year in the preparation of the annual Consular reports, that is a practical suggestion, and I feel perfectly certain the Secretary of State would be quite ready to carry it out.

THE RE-TRIAL OF PRISONERS.

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH, who had given notice "To ask His Majesty's Government whether their attention has been called to the case of a prisoner charged with a serious crime in regard to which the jury were unable to agree on a verdict; and whether it is the case that a period of five months must elapse before any further trial can take place," said: My Lords, I think, perhaps, a word of explanation is due from me in putting this Question as it now appears on the Paper. I had my attention called to a report of a criminal trial about three weeks ago, in which the jury disagreed as to their verdict, and the Judge ordered that the prisoner should be detained in custody until the next Assizes, which were five months off. I therefore put this Question on the Paper to ascertain whether that was an absolutely necessary incident in the regulation of the criminal procedure of this country.

Sofar as the particular case is concerned, the matter is practically at an end. I would have brought the Question before your Lordships at once, but I was twice asked—most properly asked—by the Department concerned to postpone it as the matter was under consideration. Your Lordships have since been informed, through the usual channels of information, that the criminal authorities have come to the conclusion that there is no case for a further prosecution, and the prisoner has been released. Therefore, so far as any particular personal incident is concerned the matter is at an end; but there was a good deal of attention attracted to the point as to whether it was necessary to detain a prisoner for so long a period before a second trial could be obtained.

I may be wrong, but I understand that there were two courses open to the learned Judge who presided at the trial —either to have ordered another trial later in the Assizes, or to take the course which, in the exercise of his discretion, he took, of ordering the prisoner's detention till another term of Assizes. In Scotland there is a power in the Crown to move the venue, and there is also a power on the part of the prisoner, by a process known as "running his letters," to secure a trial within a certain number of days. All I want now to ask is whether, in the unfortunate event of a jury disagreeing in their verdict, it is ever likely to be necessary in England to detain a prisoner for so long a period as five or six months before another trial can be obtained. If that is so, it is a point to which the attention of those responsible ought to be directed with a view to diminishing the possibility of such an occurrence taking place.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Loreburn): My Lords, so far as the particular case in question is concerned, I understand, as the noble Lord has said, that the Attorney-General has entered a *nolle prosequi*. It is a matter which rests entirely in his own discretion, and I imagine that no Attorney-General would listen to anyone who attempted to interfere with his discretion in the administration of criminal justice.

The case was one relating to murder, and the peculiarity is that that is one of the crimes which cannot be tried otherwise than by a Judge of the High Court, or by a Commissioner of Assize, or somebody holding His Majesty's Commission entitling him to try the case. Murder cases, fortunately, are not very common, and the disagreement of juries is, likewise, not very common. The Judge, in the exercise of his discretion, said that this case was to go over to the next assizes. In view of the fact that the Attorney-General has since entered a *nolle prosequi*, it is pretty obvious that this course was adopted because the Judge thought the man ought not to be put on his trial again and that the Crown had better drop the prosecution. I infer that from the circumstances.

The learned Judge could, if he had wished, have tried the case again at once, or he could have tried it at the end of the assizes, or a new Commission might have been issued, if it had been necessary, for trying the case at any time. There is also a power under Act of Parliament by which the Attorney-General can move a case to the Central Criminal Court. I do not wish to prejudge the point, and I must not be understood as expressing the definite opinion that that procedure would have been applicable to the case in question, but, at all events, there is the statute. No one feels more strongly than I that it is in the highest degree inexpedient that persons awaiting trial should be confined for any considerable length of time.

In the ordinary kind of cases, where it is not a serious matter like that of murder, I think there ought to be a far more liberal admission to bail than there is at present in this country. I cannot too strongly express that view. As a matter of fact, it is impossible for many people to escape if they wanted to, and the great majority of people who are accused have no means or thought of escape. I should be very glad to learn that the practice of allowing bail, which, as I have said, can be done with perfect safety in a great number of cases, had become the rule rather than the exception. In regard to the crime of murder, disagreement on the part of the jury is uncommon, and, therefore, the particular evil which was threatened in the present case is one not likely frequently to occur. Still for all that, the interval before retrial should be made as short as possible, and I hope there will be very few cases in which a long period will elapse before any further trial can take place. If the noble Lord has any suggestions to make upon the subject I am perfectly certain that those who have charge of the administration of criminal justice will be only too glad to consider them, with a view to preventing the possibility of frequent delay for any length of time in the retrial of prisoners.

*LORD ALVERSTONE: My Lords, this matter is one of such great importance that I should like to say a word or two upon it. I entirely agree with the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack with the exception of one observation. I do not think that it ought to be inferred, and it would be a dangerous thing if it were inferred, that, because a learned Judge directed a trial to stand over to the next Assizes, he had any view on the question as to whether or not the prisoner should again be put on his trial. It may be that that was in the learned Judge's mind in this particular case; but for a great many years it has not been the practice to try again at the same Assizes prisoners in regard to whose cases the jury had not agreed, and for some reasons I think it is wise that the present practice should be continued. It may be that there should be some alteration of the law in that respect; but I doubt very much whether it is desirable to lay down a hard-and-fast rule. The practice has been, in cases where juries disagree, to try the prisoners again at the next Assizes. I think there should be some consideration whether the provisions of Palmer's Act, if they are not wide enough to allow removal in such a case, should not be extended; and I should like to associate myself with my noble and learned friend in not expressing any opinion as to whether or not, under that Act, there could be a removal simply on the ground of delay.

But there are other considerations which have to be borne in mind. I am not now speaking of this particular case. In many cases where the jury has shown inability to agree it is very desirable that there should be some further time for inquiry in the interests of both justice and the prisoner. There has been, unfortunately, a practice on the part of prisoners to reserve their defence until the very last moment and not to disclose it until they come up for trial at the Assizes, with the result that the prosecution are at the disadvantage of not being able properly to test whether the defence is well founded. In the interests of the prisoner it is not undesirable that there should be some interval for inquiry, though I agree with Lord Balfour of Burleigh that there should not be such a delay as five months. I may point out that this is by no means the first time that this has occurred. Your Lordships may probably remember the Essex murder four or five years ago. The prisoner was twice tried in the county of Essex, the jury disagreeing on both occasions and a *nolle prosequi* was entered by the Attorney-General. The matter is one which should be dealt with by the Government of the day. If we are to alter the law which has existed for centuries that a murder trial should take place in the county in which the offence was committed the alteration should be made by carefully considered legislation, and should not be left to the circumstances of any particular case. I do not quite agree with my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack that bail affects this particular question, and I am able to assure him that the number of cases in which bail is refused is very few indeed. It is not usual, however, to allow bail in murder cases, except under exceptional circumstances. I am bound to say, after a very considerable experience, that, while I entirely agree that in every single case prisoners should be bailed if possible, the condition of many of these people is often such that they are a great deal better off, and better cared for and looked after, when they are not admitted to bail. But I thoroughly agree with the noble and learned Lord the Lord Chancellor that, except under most exceptional circumstances, persons who are going to be tried for ordinary offences should be admitted to bail; and that is the practice which, as far as is possible, those engaged in the administration of the criminal law adopt.

CRIMINAL APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 29th June, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Tollemache Estate Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz., Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Bristol Tramways Bill [Lords]; Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords].—Considered ; to be read the third time.

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway Bill [Lords]; Keighley Corporation Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan District Railway Bill [Lords]; Northern Assurance Company Bill [Lords]; Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill [Lords] (by Order).—Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Wednesday.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to :—North-East London Railway Bill; Bury and District Joint Water Board Bill, without Amendment; Leicester Corporation Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Paisley District Tramways." [Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Bridgend (Extension), Hendon (Amendment), Llandaff and Dinas Powis (Amendment), Llansamlet, Oulton Broad, Sowerby Bridge (Amendment), and Tewkesbury (Amendment)." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Gott Bay and Vaila." [Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Provost, Magistrates, and Councillors of the Burgh of Leith to construct additional tramways and to execute street improvements ; and for other purposes." [Leith Burgh Bill [Lords].

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time ; and ordered (under Section 9 of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 283.]

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3. Bill [Lords].—Read the first time ; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 284.]

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time ; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 285.]

Leith Burgh Bill [Lords].—Read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against : From Sussex ; and Sidlesham ; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour : From Cumberland and North Lancashire and London ; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under The Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of August, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (DANGEROUS AND UNHEALTHY INDUSTRIES).

Copy presented, of Regulations, dated 20th June, 1908, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 79 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, for the process of the casting of Brass [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1908–9).

Copy presented, of Explanatory Memorandum by the Under-Secretary of State for India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 4031 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ISLE OF MAN.

Account presented, of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ended 31st March, 1908, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 196.]

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS ACTS, 1877 AND 1907.

Copy presented, of Order dated 18th June, 1908, entitled the Destructive Insects and Pests Order of 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Lunacy. Copy of Sixty-second Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 200.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Shipping Masters at Antwerp.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that certain persons at the port of Antwerp, who styled themselves as shipping masters or agents for British ships, are charging seamen fees from 7 francs up to 25 francs; whether he is aware that a seaman named G. H. Knox, of the "Ilwen," was compelled to pay a shipping master by the name of Cook 25 francs as shipping fees; and whether he will take steps to compel masters of ships to hand the advance note to seamen at the Consul's office at the time of the signing of the agreement.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The attention of the Board of Trade has been called to the fact that certain shipping masters at Antwerp charge seamen fees for obtaining them employment. I am informed that the seaman referred to by my hon. friend deserted his ship at Cardiff and that payment of his advance note was stopped, consequently no fee was received by the shipping master who found him employment on the "Ilwen." The Board of Trade have no power to compel masters to hand advance notes to seamen at the time of signing the agreement in cases where the seamen agree to enter into a private arrangement outside the consulate. The Board, with the assistance of the Consul-General, have endeavoured to discourage the irregular system prevailing at Antwerp, but I will consider whether any further useful steps can be taken in the matter.

Regulations for admittance to Training Colleges.

MR. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that students qualified for admittance to training colleges in the county of London are not allowed to enter their names for more than one, and that, should they fail to gain admittance for denominational or other reasons, the new regulations of the Board of Education requiring students to be admitted to such colleges as the Borough Road Training College, Isleworth, according to priority of application, prevents the choice being made according to the ability of candidates, and practically debars some of the best from continuing their careers; and will he inquire of the principals of these colleges as to the working of these regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Board of Education are not aware that the authorities of any college have refused to accept applications from candidates who are known to them to be applying for admission to another college. The Board have not laid down any rule to the effect either that students may not enter their names for more than one college or that students must be admitted to a college according to priority of application. In these circumstances, and in view of the fact that certain modifications in the Board's regulations as to admission have to-day been published, I think I cannot advantageously take the step suggested in the concluding paragraph of the Question. But any special case of hardship or unreasonable exclusion that is brought to my notice will be most carefully considered.

Statues on British Medical Association Building.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the character of some of the statues on the new building of the British Medical Association now in the course of erection in the Strand; and what action, if any, he intends to take in the matter.

(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am not officially the arbiter either of taste or morals, and I have no control over the decoration of private buildings unless they violate the law. Were it otherwise I should see no reason for interference.

Public Statues.

Mr. HORNIMAN: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he proposes to call for a Report from the Commissioner of Police on the statues, nude and otherwise, ornamenting or disfiguring the streets and open spaces, as well as public and other buildings in London, and as to their effect on public morals.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) No, Sir.

Training Colleges for Women.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that certain of the secondary training colleges for women are in actual danger of being closed for financial reasons, owing to the check to training and the uncertainty caused by the breakdown of the register; whether he can give any immediate reassuring expression of the views of the Board of Education as to the value and advisability of training for intending teachers in secondary schools; can he indicate whether, in addition to a desire to encourage training for teachers in secondary schools, the Board have any means which they intend to employ to assist secondary training colleges, and to secure tangible advantages for such teachers as do expend time and money in taking a course of training in a secondary training college.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I hope that the financial difficulties referred to may be greatly diminished by a system of grants, which the Board have decided to initiate, in aid of courses of professional training for men or women intending to be teachers in secondary schools. Regulations under which these grants are to be payable will be laid upon the Table of the House during the next fortnight. In reply to the concluding paragraph of the Question, the Board's Regulations for Secondary Schools make special provision on the point in Article 15, page 4, of the 1908 issue.

Irish Primary Schools excluded from Supplementary Grant.

Mr. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of primary schools in Ireland in which the attendance is under thirty-five; and on what grounds they have been excluded from participation in the supplementary grant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that there are 2,858 national schools in which the average attendance is under thirty-five. As to the latter part of the Question, I would refer to the Answer given by my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury to the hon. Member's Question of 26th June.

Irish Universities Bill—Extern Students.

Mr. J. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the senates of the proposed Universities would have power under the Universities Bill as it stands to make any provisions, by statute or otherwise, dealing with the extern students or with students who have partially passed their examinations as extern students at the present time; and, if not, whether he can see his way so to amend the Bill as to leave such power to be exercised by the senates at their discretion.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) If the hon. Member will refer to Clause 10 (3) of the Irish Universities Bill he will find that all students, extern or other, of the Royal University of Ireland are entitled, when that University is dissolved, to get credit for any progress they may have made towards a degree in that university. If he will then refer to Article XVIII. (1) (*c*) of the preliminary drafts of the charters he will see that the senates for a period of five years will have power to make arrangements for enabling such students to proceed to degrees in the universities by examination alone, that is, without requiring any residence at a constituent college or any recognised institution. I have undertaken to bring up on Report, if I find that it is necessary, words that will secure the rights of all existing students to have opportunities of proceeding to degrees on existing conditions.

Troops engaged in the Mohmand Expedition.

Mr. HADDOCK (Lancashire, North Lonsdale): To ask the Under-Secretary o State for India how many troops have been engaged in the Mohmand expedition.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The number of troops employed in the Mohmand expedition was approximately 16,000, of whom 4,000 were in the Reserve Brigade.

Disturbances at Rathdowney (Queen's County).

Mr. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received particulars of the disturbance at Rathdowney, Queen's County, on the 20th instant; whether several constables were injured by stones and bottles; and what was the cause of this outbreak.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The question of taking proceedings in this case is under consideration, and it would therefore be undesirable to make any statement upon the subject at present.

Irish Labourers Provided with Allotments.

Mr. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the total number of labourers who have been provided with cottage plots or allotments under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, 1883 to 1906, the total area of land so allocated, and the average extent of each plot or allotment.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The total number of labourers' cottages provided up to the 31st March last was 22,921. In 13,143 of these cases the allotments attached do not exceed half a statute acre; in 513 cases they are between one-half and three-quarters of an acre; and in the remaining 9,265 cases beween three-quarters of an acre and one acre, which latter is the maximum allotment. The total quantity of land so taken for allotments may therefore be taken to be approximately 16,220 acres; and in addition about 60 acres have been taken for allotments for labourers' cottages which had already been provided. The average extent of each cottage plot or allotment is somewhat less than three roods.

Suggested Grant to John Gillen, late Royal Irish Rifles.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the fact that John Gillen, of Longford, No. 999, 6th company, 1st battalion, Royal Irish Rifles, who lost his health in India, is now in a chronic state of ill-health and poverty in Longford, he will ask the Patriotic Fund Commissioners to make him a small grant to help him in his old age.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I regret that I cannot undertake to recommend this case to the Royal Patriotic Fund Corporation, as the man is not eligible for assistance from any of the funds administered by that body. He had less than three years' service and rendered no war service.

Civil Servants and Territorial Camps.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that in some Government offices regulations have been issued which make it necessary for civil servants in the Territorial Force going to camp to find substitutes during their absence; that, although officials receive both their civil and military pay whilst so doing, the cost of a substitute may mean a considerable loss; and whether he proposes to take any step to prevent this happening.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) Arrangements have been sanctioned under which any reasonable excess beyond the civil and military pay of the civil servants referred to will be defrayed from public funds.

Honours for Army Officers.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary of State for War how many orders in each grade were bestowed on Army officers in 1907 in the Bath, St. Michael and St. George, the Star of India, and the Royal Victorian Order.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The orders bestowed in 1907 on Army officers on the active and retired lists, including Indian Army officers, were as follows—

G.C.B., Military	2
K.C.B., Military	16
C.B., Military	71
C.B., Civil	1
G.C.M.G.	1
K.C.M.G.	2
C.M.G.	2
C.S.I.	1
K.C.V.O.	4
C.V.O.	7
M.V.O., 4th Class	14
M.V.O., 5th Class	3

Of the C.B.'s, thirty-four were specially granted on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the military operations in India in 1857.

Suez Canal Surplus Revenue.

Mr. MOLTENO (Dumfriesshire): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the fact that the hopes of the British directors of the Suez Canal that a method of adjusting the partition of the surplus revenue more acceptable to the clients of the company might eventually be arrived at were expressed in August, 1906, after the reduction of 75 centimes had been made in January of that year, he can ascertain what prospect there is of these hopes being realised at an early date; whether he can state what was the amount of the considerable sums stated to have been expended since that date on the improvement of the canal; and whether this amount is such as seriously to delay the realisation of these hopes.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) In the Report of the Suez Canal Company to the shareholders for the year 1907 it was stated that very considerable works were required for deepening and widening the Canal in order to keep pace with the constant increase in the dimensions of the vessels making use of it. The present depth of the Canal is nowhere less than 28 feet, and it is intended to increase this depth until the figure of 36 feet has been obtained throughout. This work will be commenced in 1909, and will take some five years to complete. This must of necessity entail a very heavy expenditure, and a further large sum will be required for the completion of the new docks at Port Said, which work is now in progress. Until these works have been completed no further reduction in the transit dues should be anticipated. The receipts from this source for the first six months of the current year show a decrease of some millions of francs as compared with the figures for the same period of last year. In these circumstances it is not thought that the present moment would be opportune for the introduction of any change in the partition of the surplus.

New Class Assistant Clerks.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state how many new class assistant clerks are employed in the Savings Bank Department, General Post Office; Estate Duty Office, Somerset House; and Statistical Office, His Majesty's Customs, respectively, and how many have been promoted to a superior grade in each Department; and whether he can state the principle of selection adopted with regard to the promotion of new class assistant clerks in the Statistical Office.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*)—

———	Number of Assistant Clerks (New Class) employed.	Number promoted.
Savings Bank Department - - -	130	20*
Estate Duty Office - - - - -	66	8
Customs Statistical Office - - - -	151	2†

Promotions of assistant clerks under the Board of Customs, as in other Departments, are under Order in Council only made exceptionally upon grounds of special merit, after not less than six years service. In comparing the Customs Statistical Office with other Departments, it must be borne in mind that in that office, besides the assistant clerks (new class), abstractors are also employed, now numbering thirty-six. From that class eighteen promotions have been made to superior grades.

Notification of Births.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that on 9th April a certified midwife was convicted under the Notification of Births Act for failing to notify the birth of a child, whilst no proceeding was taken against the father; and whether, in view of the fact that under the Act parents are responsible in the first instance for the notification of births, he will consider as to the advisability of issuing a Circular to local authorities drawing their attention to the responsibility of parents in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) My attention has not been drawn to the particular case mentioned in the Question. The Act, however, imposes the duty of notifying a birth alike on the father, if he is actually residing in the house when the child is born, and on any person in attendance on the mother at the time of the birth or within six hours after it. It will be seen, therefore, that it is always the duty of the person in attendance to notify the birth, although it is provided that a person shall not be liable to a penalty for failing to do so if he had reasonable grounds to believe that notice had been duly given by some other person. I issued a Circular to the local authorities shortly after the passing of the Act in which I drew attention to the duties in this matter of the father and of the persons in attendance on the mother.

---

* In addition twenty-three have been appointed to other situations in the Post Office as a result of limited competitions.

† Two more have been nominated for promotion, but have not yet passed the necessary qualifying examination held by the Civil Service Commissioners.

Thames-side Villages and Towns.

Mr. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the names of all places abutting on either side of the Thames between Lechlade and Teddington, showing whether these are separate parishes, urban districts, or boroughs, with the population of each.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The list is a somewhat long one, and, instead of setting it out here, perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to send him a copy of it.

Accidents at Portsmouth Dockyard—Medical Staff.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how many cases of accident at the Portsmouth Dockyard have been dealt with by the medical officers and by the surgery attendants respectively during the last six months, and what are the actual hours the medical officers are supposed to be in attendance at the dockyard surgery.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) During the past six months 5,189 cases of accident have been treated at the dockyard surgery. The surgery attendants apply first aid only. The medical officers are responsible for all treatment, and there is therefore no separate list of cases treated by attendants. A medical officer is in actual attendance in the dockyard surgery from 9 a.m. till noon and from 2 p.m. till 5 p.m. (bell-ringing). During the remainder of the twenty-four hours a medical officer is available at his official residence inside the dockyard.

Honours for Navy Officers.

Mr. BELLAIRS: To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how many orders in each grade were bestowed on naval officers in 1907 in the Bath, St. Michael and St. George, the Star of India, and the Royal Victorian Order.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The numbers are as follows:—

1. Bath:—

G.C.B.	Nil.
K.C.B. (Military Division)	3
C.B. (Military Division)	6
(Including 1 Marine officer).	
C.B. (Civil Division)	1

2. St. Michael and St. George:—

K.C.M.G.	1
C.M.G.	1

3. Star of India:—

Nil.

4. Royal Victorian Order:—

G.C.V.O.	2
K.C.V.O.	2
C.V.O.	12
M.V.O. 4th Class	9
(Including 1 Marine officer).	
M.V.O. 5th Class	1

Adulteration of Flour with Talc.

Mr. HALPIN (Clare, W.): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) whether he is aware that 600 tons of talc is shipped every month from Bordeaux to Liverpool and New York, and that large consignments are sent to Ireland from Liverpool; whether he is aware that talc is used in adulterating flour; and will he instruct the inspectors to take samples of flour and have them analysed.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The Department have no definite information respecting the importations referred to. If the hon. Member will kindly furnish them with any specific particulars in his possession as to the importations of talc, and as to its suspected use as an adulterant of flour in any locality, the matter will be followed up. Samples of flour are taken from time to time by local food inspectors for analysis under the Sale of Food and Drugs Acts.

Applications for Small Holdings in Surrey.

Mr. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Small Holdings Commissioners have taken any steps to ascertain the extent of the demand for small holdings and allotments in Surrey, as directed by Section 2 of the Small Holdings Allotments Act, and, if they have so ascertained any such demand, whether they have reported to the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries as directed by the Act; and, if such a Report has been made, have the Board considered it, and notified the county council for Surrey to prepare a scheme in accordance with Section 3, subsection 1, of the above Act.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Commissioners have ascertained that up to the 22nd instant applications for small holdings have been received by the Surrey County Council from 197 persons for 2,560 acres. The council have appointed a land agent and sub-committees to deal with these applications, and the Board have no doubt that schemes will be submitted to them as soon as the necessary inquiries have been made. In these circumstances it has not been requisite either for the Commissioners or the Board to take more specific action in the matter.

Cattle-driving in County Sligo.

SIR GEORGE FARDELL (Paddington, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on 10th May, 1908, and again on a later date, cattle-drives took place at Taumagh farm, County Sligo, in the midst of the country where the anti-ranching campaign of the United Irish League is in full swing, off the property of Dr. Duke, who has nothing to do with the eleven months system, and another drive of grazing cattle off the lands of Reask, near Boyle, on Tuesday, 26th May last; and will he state what action the police have taken or propose to take.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The dates are not quite correctly stated, but it is the fact that in the months of May and June several cattle-drives have taken place from farms the property of Dr. Duke. In each case the cattle have been found uninjured and returned to the farms. Some of the animals were the property of Dr. Duke, and others belonged to farmers who had taken grazing for periods of six months. The offenders were not discovered. The police forces of Counties Sligo and Roscommon have been considerably strengthened with the object of preventing cattle-drives, and a special police hut has been established at Ross for the protection of grazing farms, including two belonging to Dr. Duke.

Greencastle Police and Travellers on Licensed Premises during Closed Hours.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that it is customary for members of the Royal Irish Constabulary to visit public-houses at Greencastle for the purpose of ascertaining whether customers are *bona fide* travellers, and, after questioning the customers, to march them to the police barrack for the purpose of ascertaining by telephone whether they slept at the addresses given in the public-houses; whether such a system is in accordance with the police rules; and, if not, whether he will order its discontinuance.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that large numbers of persons enter public-houses at Greencastle on Sundays as *bona fide* travellers. It is the duty of the police to visit the public-houses in order to enforce the Licensing Acts, and it has been found that very few of the persons found drinking on Sundays give their correct names and addresses. If a constable has reasonable grounds to suppose that the name or address given is false he may require evidence of the correctness of such name and address, and, in default of its production, may forthwith apprehend the person and take him before a magistrate. (Licensing Act (Ireland) 1874, Section 27.) Rather than take this extreme measure the police at Greencastle have been in the habit of asking persons to come to the adjacent police station to have their names and addresses verified, which they do voluntarily, and it has been found that very few of the persons so taken to the station have given correct names and addresses in the first instance. The alternative to the adoption of this course would, as

I have already indicated, be the apprehension of the persons under the section quoted.

Hours of Duty of Belfast Prison Officers.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, for some years past, the officers in Belfast prison were not to be on duty for more than ten hours daily, and that, where they were on duty for more than ten hours daily, they were allowed the extra time off duty afterwards; whether this regulation has now been suspended, and, if so, why; whether some of the officers are obliged to be on duty for sixteen hours per day; whether any such system obtains in any other Irish prison; whether any vacancies exist on the staff, and, if so, why they are not filled up; and whether he will have inquiries made into the whole matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Under an arrangement which has been in force for some years in Belfast and all other prisons, the period of duty of prison officers is limited as far as practicable to ten hours each day, and a period of relief from duty in the earlier part of the day is allowed to officers who are required for evening duty. This arrangement is necessarily liable to suspension when officers are ill, on leave, or on special duty, or where temporary vacancies exist. In Belfast prison it has been necessary to suspend the arrangement for thirteen days during the present month as regards male officers only, owing to the simultaneous existence of all the causes mentioned. While this suspension was in force, an officer detailed for evening duty was on duty for thirteen hours in the day, three hours being allowed for meals; but each officer's turn for such duty occurred every tenth day only, and on the recent occasion no man was affected more than twice. There is at present one vacancy at Belfast, which has been filled up as from 3rd July. A few days' delay must necessarily occur in the filling of a vacancy. I am informed that the prison officers at Belfast have cheerfully acquiesced in the recent suspension of the customary relief, as to have granted it would have necessitated the recall of officers on annual vacation and the postponement of leave for others.

Reports on Schools in Circuit 8 (Belfast).

MR. J. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state why so many reports on schools in Circuit 8 (Belfast) have been reduced during the last twelve months; and how many teachers will suffer in increments and promotion owing to that reduction.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that, in their opinion, it would not be in the public interest or tend to the efficiency of their inspecting staff to make any statement in reply to this Question.

Portarlington Senior School Inspector.

MR. J. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland are aware that the voice of their senior inspector at Portarlington is so weak as frequently to be inaudible to the children; that he is angry when teachers repeat to the children what he says; and that in consequence of this defect teachers suffer; will the Commissioners take steps to ascertain if he is physically unfit for his office; and, if so, will they retire him on pension.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they are not aware that the facts are as suggested in the Question, and that they do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Irish Schools—Mr. MacMillan's Reports.

MR. J. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the attention of the Commissioners of National Education has been drawn to the fact that in Section 1 of the Appendix to their 72nd Report, page 72, Mr. MacMillan says only 50 out of 135 schools, or 37 per cent., were considered good or better by that inspector, while in the Board's 73rd Report 62·7 per cent. of all the schools in Ireland are reported as good or better; can the Board explain this discrepancy and also state if a similar result has followed this inspector in every circuit in which he has been placed; and what steps the Board will take to protect teachers from over-exacting inspectors.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that a comparison cannot properly be instituted between the two statements mentioned in the Question, seeing that Mr. MacMillan's statement concerns but 135 schools and relates to the year 1905, while the statement in the Commissioners' Annual Report concerns all the schools in Ireland and relates to the year 1906. The Commissioners do not consider that it would be in the public interest or tend to the efficiency of their inspection staff to make any statement in reply to the remainder of the Question.

Purchase of the Thompson Estate at Clonfin.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the result of the efforts by the Estates Commissioners to purchase the Thompson estate at Clonfin, County Longford.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As suggested in the hon. Member's Question of 25th May, the Estates Commissioners have communicated with the receiver under deed of this estate, who has informed them he is in correspondence with the present owner, Mr. Wensley Thompson, now in Canada, and with his solicitors in England, and hopes shortly to be in a position to communicate further with the Commissioners as to the sale of the estate.

Evicted Tenants Applications sent in after May, 1907.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the case of evicted tenants' applications sent in after May, 1907, the Commissioners will direct their inspector to hold inquiries into such applications; and, if so, how soon these inquiries will be made.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners do not propose to take any action upon applications from evicted tenants received after 1st May, 1907, unless and until the estates to which the applications relate come before them for sale under The Irish Land Act, 1903, or until the applications received prior to that date have been disposed of.

Children (Cuffe) in Granard Workhouse.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant an inquiry into the circumstances attending the discharge of the two children Cuffe from industrial schools, and their transference to the workhouse of Granard as pauper children; and will he say what steps have been taken to secure that the treatment of these poor children shall tend to make them good and useful citizens in their after life.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer which was given to his Question on this subject on the 24th instant. My predecessor ordered the discharge of the children from industrial schools under the powers vested in him by statute and, so far as I am aware, I have no power to re-open the matter by means of an inquiry or otherwise.

Application for One Year's Training from Irish School Teachers.

MR. J. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can ascertain from the Commissioners of National Education the number of applicants for one year's course of training during 1907–8, the number of such applicants who were admitted to training and the number of applicants who passed the scholarship examination, but who were refused admission to training.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the number of applications for the year's course of training during 1909–8 in the seven recognised training colleges in Ireland was 271; the number of applicants admitted was 100; and the number of applicants who passed the

King's scholarship examination, but did not secure admission, was ninety.

Reinstatement of James Murphy, of Croughteeri.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say why the Estates Commissioners have decided to take no action in reference to the reinstatement of James Murphy, of Croughteeri, near Feenagh, in his holding from which he was evicted by Deane Skelton; and is he entitled to the benefit of the Irish Land Act, 1903, in this respect.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have nothing to add to the reply given to the hon. Member's previous Question on this subject on the 24th instant.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Contracts — Provisions for Fair Wages.

Mr. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the firm of Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company, Elswick, have recently engaged inexperienced men on the work of electrical wiremen on H.M.S. "Invincible," at rates of wages not in harmony with the Fair Wage Clause; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if he can now say why Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company, Elswick, have not carried out the Fair Wage Clause in their contract on H.M.S. "Invincible" at the Elswick works with regard to the wages paid to the electrical wire workers.

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.): If the hon. Member will permit me, I will answer these Questions together. The Admiralty have been, and are still, in correspondence with both the firm of Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth, and Company, and the Electrical Trades Union, with regard to the statement that there has been a departure from the provisions of the Fair Wages Clause; but the facts have not yet been sufficiently clearly ascertained to enable us to decide what steps are necessary. The required information is being hastened as much as possible.

Mr. HUDSON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this Question was first put down on 5th March, and repeated on 19th May, and yet the information is not forthcoming? Has he been in communication with the Electrical Trades Union?

Mr. McKENNA: Yes, there have been communications with that body and there has been considerable correspondence, but, of course, the Admiralty cannot obtain information so readily from private firms as from their own dockyards.

The Coastguard and the Summer Manœuvres.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty if the coastguards will be drawn upon to assist in manning the ships to take part in the summer manœuvres; and, if so, to what extent and in which fleet will they be employed.

Mr. McKENNA: The summer embarkation of a section of the coastguard is provided for in the Coastguard Regulations, and will take place this summer as usual. The total number of coastguard men to be embarked is 1,300, and they will be employed in the ships of the Home Fleet.

Discussion of Naval Estimates.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the usual number of allotted days are to be given to Committee of Supply on the Navy Estimates this year; and whether he can state the last occasion on which the Vote for the Admiralty Office was discussed.

Mr. McKENNA: Of Government time this session, the following days have been devoted to naval discussion :—2nd March, on the Motion of my hon. friend the Member for Falkirk; 3rd March, on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair; 9th March, Vote A; 10th March, Vote 1 and Vote 10; with a day and a half more this month in Committee on Supply, the usual time allotted will be made up. Vote 12 was last discussed in 1906.

Mr. ASHLEY: But is it not the fact that in 1906 the Secretary of the Admiralty said there was no time to discuss this Vote and at once closured the debate ?

Mr. McKENNA'S reply was inaudible.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): Will the full number of days be given for the Navy Votes this year ?

Mr. McKENNA: The number of days will be equal to the average for the last three years.

Mr. J. M. MACDONALD (Falkirk Burghs): When will Vote 8 be taken ?

Mr. McKENNA: Some time in July.

Naval Collisions.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, in view of the fact that no official report exists of certain alleged collisions and groundings which were omitted from the Return issued during the recess, whether he will allow the hon. Member for Blackpool to inspect the logs of these ships for the dates named.

Mr. McKENNA: It is greatly regretted that this suggestion could not be permitted.

Mr. ASHLEY: I trust that is not due to a fear that the hon. Member lacks discretion ?

Mr. McKENNA: Not in the least.

Mr. BELLAIRS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the collisions are said to have taken place in the Home Fleet—the special creation of His Majesty's Government ? In view of the inference that may be drawn from that fact, will he not reconsider his decision ?

Mr. McKENNA asked for notice of any further Question.

Middleburg Cantonments and Farms.

*****Sir CHARLES W. DILKE** (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can inform the House what has been the total cost of the cantonments and farm at Middleburg, in Cape Colony, including the net loss upon the working of the farm; and if he can state the prices paid for stock and the prices realised.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Haldane, Haddington): Approximately the total cost was £458,000. There is no charge against Army funds in connection with the working of the farm, all advances of public money having been repaid. The farm is now being closed down. There is no information in the War Office as regards the prices paid and realised for stock.

Soldiers in Penal Servitude.

Mr. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War with reference to the Annual Report on the Army [Cd. 3978], page 71, what were the rank and corps of the five men serving abroad who were sentenced to penal servitude during the year ending 30th September, 1907; if he will give in each case the offence or offences for which each man was tried, the sentences inflicted, when, where, and by whom they were tried, and the names of the persons who confirmed the sentences; whether the evidence has since been submitted to the Judge-Advocate-General, and if he sanctioned each sentence.

Mr. HALDANE: The following are the particulars asked for—

Rank.	Corps.	Offence.	Sentence.	Tried		Sentence confirmed by.	Date.
				at	by		
Private.	1st King's Royal Rifle Corps.	Striking a Sergeant in the execution of his office, and insubordinate and disloyal language.	3 years.	Cairo.	General Court Martial.	G.O.C. the Force in Egypt.	7/2/07.
"	2nd Royal Inniskillen Fusiliers.	Attempted murder - -	7 "	"	" "	" " "	3/6/07.
Gunner.	Royal Garrison Artillery.	Wilful defiance of a superior officer and causing a mutiny.	5 "	Singapore	" "	G.O.C. Straits.	26/6/07.
"	" " "	Wounding with intent to cause grievous bodily harm.	3 "	Ambala.	" "	G.O.C. in C. Northern Army	4/3/07.
Private.	1st South Wales Borderers.	Using threatening language and offering violence to his superior officer in the execution of his duty.	5 "	Quetta.	" "	G.O.C. 4th Division.	20/2/07.

Metropolitan Volunteer Permanent Staff.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what action, if any, has been taken by the London Association with respect to the allowances formerly given to non-commissioned officers of the permanent staff of Metropolitan Volunteer regiments before their transfer to the Territorial Army; whether, in view of the fact that official sanction was given to these allowances in an order by the General Officer Commanding Home District, A—1846—21, dated 15th August, 1904, he will see that no injustice is done to these soldiers, who left their regiments and joined the Volunteers under the belief that they would receive the allowance in addition to their pay.

MR. HALDANE: No proposed scale of emoluments to be paid by the London County Association to the permanent staff for work outside their ordinary duties has been yet put forward by the Assiociation. The War Office is, however, in communication with the City Association as to the scale to be fixed for the permanent staff of its units.

MR. ASHLEY: Did not the War Office issue a circular stating that nothing beyond £6 10s. should be paid?

MR. HALDANE was understood to say that that was not the amount.

Cavalry Regiment for Scotland.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what steps he has taken towards the quartering of a Regular cavalry regiment in Scotland.

MR. HALDANE: I can only refer the hon. and gallant Member to the reply I gave him on the 22nd instant.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Is the House to assume that no steps are to be taken?

MR. HALDANE: If it does it will draw a very wrong inference.

Piershill Barracks.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the barracks at Piershill are now in all respects sanitary and healthy; and what is the percentage of men, women, and children, respectively, on the sick list.

MR. HALDANE: The information requested by the hon. and gallant Member will be called for from the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief.

Mr. Churchill and the War Office.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the President of the Board of Trade is permitted to use a room at the War Office where he has access to departmental information in connection with military matters.

MR. HALDANE: No, Sir.

The Cardwell System.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if any scheme is under consideration involving modification of the Cardwell system, or entailing any substantial reduction of the garrisons overseas.

MR. HALDANE: No, Sir.

The Discontent in India.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that the partitioning of Bengal by the late Government lies at the root of much of the discontent in India, His Majesty's Government will rectify this administration Act, which never received the assent of this House.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The partition of Bengal did not require the assent of this House, and the Secretary of State finds nothing to add to the language used by the late Prime Minister and by himself in the House of Commons in 1906.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is it not the case that the Mahomedans of all classes, and Hindoos of all but the upper classes, have repudiated the assumption that they are opposed to the partition and have passed public resolutions to this effect ?

MR. BUCHANAN'S reply was inaudible.

The Simla Scheme.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the Simla scheme reached this country too late last year to receive the attention of this House; and whether, in view of the unrest in India, he will press upon the Government of India the necessity of submitting, without further delay, such comprehensive reforms for the consideration of His Majesty's Government and of this House as are calculated to remove the grievances of His Majesty's Indian subjects.

MR. BUCHANAN: I have nothing to add to the reply given by the Prime Minister to a similar Question of the hon. Member on the 25th instant.

Press Prosecutions in India.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he has received a Report concerning the conviction of Ramchandra Narayen Mendlik, editor and publisher of the Vihari, who has been sentenced to two years' imprisonment, with a fine of 1,000 rupees, for having published an alleged seditious article; and whether he has seen the article in question, and can state its terms.

MR. BUCHANAN: The conviction of this editor and the sentence as stated in the Question have been announced in the newspapers, but we have not received any official confirmation. The Secretary of State has seen the substance of the article in question, but I cannot lay it on the Table.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Can any means be adopted to put the House in possession of information as to the character of the article in question ?

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary for State for India has already given a promise that newspaper articles which come under the Press Act will be laid from time to time upon the Table of the House.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): Was not the article in this particular case a translation of a piece of poetry by Mazzini written fifty years ago ?

MR. BUCHANAN: I am not aware of that, but Mazzini wrote some very strong things.

Southern Nigeria—Penalties in Gin.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, is His Majesty's Government aware that merchants in the Delta of the Niger complain that fines imposed by the Government in Southern Nigeria are paid by the offenders in gin, and that, by its acceptance of such payments, the Government directly discourages the establishment of a currency in specie and encourages a currency in gin; and will he say what action His Majesty's Government is taking in the matter.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): The Secretary of State has communicated with the Governor by telegram, and is informed that the statement that fines imposed by the Government are paid in gin in any part of Southern Nigeria is entirely without foundation. I regret that such a statement should have been made.

Sale of Spirits in Southern Nigeria.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what steps have been taken by His Majesty's Government, in response to the appeal made nearly two years ago by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords, to control the retail sale of spirits in Southern Nigeria outside the limits of the Island and Colony of Lagos.

COLONEL SEELY: The Spirit Licence Ordinance of Southern Nigeria applies, not only to the Island and Colony of Lagos, but also to specified districts in the old Protectorate of Southern Nigeria, including the large trade centres and both banks of the Niger. It is the policy of His Majesty's Government that the licence system should be further applied whenever it is found practicable to extend the sphere of its operations. The Governor has been instructed to propose to the Alake of Abeokuta and to the Ibadan chiefs that regulations carrying out the provisions of the Spirit Licence Ordinance should be introduced into those towns.

Spirit Smuggling into Northern Nigeria.

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, in view of the immediate extension of the railway from Lagos to Illorin, what steps have been taken by the Government to establish a zone of prohibition, as foreshadowed by Lord Elgin, between Southern and Northern Nigeria, in order to prevent the smuggling of rail-borne spirits from Southern Nigeria into Northern Nigeria.

Colonel SEELY: The Secretary of State has approved of the rate for the carriage of spirits on the railway north of Ibadan being raised, and of the carriage of spirits on the railway being prohibited beyond Ikerun, a Southern Nigeria town ten miles south of the Northern Nigeria boundary. He has also approved of the transport of spirits on the Niger being prohibited within a distance of twenty-five miles of the Northern Nigeria boundary.

Transvaal Mines—Native Death-rate.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has any official information showing the number of deaths per annum occasioned by the substitution of black native labour for Chinese in the Transvaal mines.

Colonel SEELY: I would refer the hon. Member to what I said in answer to the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone on the 24th instant.

Mr. FELL said the Question did not appear on the Paper in the form in which he originally drafted it, and he asked if the figures did not show a much higher death-rate among natives than among Chinese.

Colonel SEELY: I have refreshed my memory as to the figures. In January, 1906, when the repatriation of Chinese began, the total number of labourers on the Rand, both Chinese and native, was 140,789, and the number of deaths was 396, giving a rate per 1,000 per annum of 33·6. In the last reported month, February, 1908, the total number of Chinese and natives was 170,000, and the number of deaths was only 346, or a death-rate of 24·4 per 1,000 per annum; so that it appears that on an increase of 30,000 the total number of deaths has been reduced by fifty.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): What were the respective numbers of Chinese in 1906 and now?

Colonel SEELY: That, of course, strengthens my argument. The total number of Chinese in January, 1906, was 47,117, and the death-rate per 1,000 was 33·6. The total number of Chinese in the last recorded month was 28,406, or a reduction of 20,000, while the death rate was 24·4.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): Can the right hon. Gentleman give the death-rate at the present moment of the Chinese and of the natives respectively?

Colonel SEELY was understood to say that the figures he had given covered that point.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY inquired if it was a fact that the death-rate among natives was greater than among the Chinese.

Colonel SEELY said it was unfortunately the case that there was a high death-rate, especially among some sections of the natives in the mines; but the total result of the action of the Transvaal Government and of this Government before they handed the matter over was a reduction of the death-rate by 28 per cent.

Australian Naval Defence.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of

State for the Colonies whether representations have been made by the Australian Commonwealth Government that the delay in approving of the naval defence scheme, submitted early in the year, is placing them in a position of great difficulty; and whether he can state when the decision of His Majesty's Government will be communicated to the Commonwealth Government.

Colonel SEELY: No such representations have been made. The Commonwealth Government are aware that His Majesty's Government are endeavouring to settle the question in the manner indicated in the reply given by my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Admiralty last Monday to a Question by the right hon. Member for East Worcestershire.

Asiatics in Rhodesia.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received any information as to the passing by the Government of Rhodesia of an Asiatic Registration Act imposing compulsory registration upon British-Indians domiciled in Rhodesia, of a character similar to that of the Transvaal Asiatic Law Amendment Act, 1907; and, if so, whether, in view of the resentment and opposition aroused among British-Indians by that measure, His Majesty's Government will make representations to the Government of Rhodesia as to the advisability of repealing the Act in question.

Colonel SEELY: The Secretary of State is in communication with the High Commissioner on the subject of the Act referred to by my hon. friend.

In reply to Mr. Lynch (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon),

Colonel SEELY said he hoped to be able to give the information asked for in a few weeks.

British Columbian Coastal Trade.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has any information of the causes why the Canadian Government has rescinded the order permitting United States vessels to participate in the coastal trade of British Columbia.

Colonel SEELY: I have no information on the subject referred to by the hon. Member, but the Canadian Government will be asked for a report.

Traffic in Arms at Muscat.

Mr. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the increasing traffic in arms, which has its headquarters at Muscat; and whether this subject will be discussed at the Arms Conference at Brussels.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. J. A. Pease, Essex, Saffron Walden; for Sir Edward Grey): The question of the traffic in arms at Muscat has already formed the subject of discussion at the Conference on the Arms Traffic now sitting at Brussels, and is still under consideration.

Gun-running in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. HART-DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the fact that Regan, on the main routes between the Persian Gulf and Seistan, has been seized and occupied by Afghans; whether this violation of Persian territory has been carried out in order to assist the operations of gun-running from the Gulf; and whether the British Government proposes to take any steps in the matter.

Mr. J. A. PEASE: His Majesty's Government have received information from time to time of the presence of bands of gun-runners in these regions, but there is nothing to show that Regan has been seized and occupied by them. Frequent representations on the subject have been made to the Persian Government, who have promised to do all in their power to check gun-running.

Mr. LYNCH: Is it true that a body of Afghans has established itself on Persian territory?

Mr. J. A. PEASE: I cannot answer that without notice.

Arrest of Grimsby Trawler in German Waters.

MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British trawler "Arcadia," of Grimsby, which was found fishing in German territorial waters off Nordeny by the German fisheries patrol torpedo-boat S.42, has been brought to Cuxhaven and her captain arrested; and whether the British Government will take similar steps in the case of trawlers flying a foreign flag found fishing illegally in Scottish territorial waters.

I beg further to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will say how the German territorial waters are delimited in the neighbourhood of Nordeny, and how far within those waters was the trawler "Arcadia" at the time of her capture, and also how far from the shore.

MR. J. A. PEASE: My right hon. friend begs to answer both the hon. Member's Questions on this subject together. The limits of territorial waters in the vicinity in question are governed as between this country and Germany by the stipulations of the North Sea Fisheries Convention of 1882. The seizure of the "Arcadia" and the arrest of her master have been reported to my right hon. friend by telegraph by His Majesty's Consul-General at Hamburg, who has instructed the British Vice-Consul at Cuxhaven to watch the case. My right hon. friend has no information as to the precise position of the vessel when she was captured, but he has no reason to suppose that the German Court will arrive at a decision incompatible with Germany's Treaty obligations or with international law, by which the action of His Majesty's Government in regard to the Moray Firth must also be controlled; and the facts of the case cannot be definitely ascertained till it is tried before the Court.

Brussels Sugar Conventions.

MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the statement by Sir Henry Bergne, printed in the White Paper [Cd. 3780] relating to the Brussels Sugar Convention, with regard to sugared products; why this reservation has not been embodied in the Additional Act; and what guarantee His Majesty's Government have that the other signatory Powers will respect such a declaration, not even recorded in the *proces verbaux*.

MR. J. A. PEASE: A statement by Sir Henry Bergne to the effect that it was not possible for His Majesty's Government to furnish certificates of origin in regard to the sugar contained in sugared products is recorded on page 86 of the *Proces Verbaux* of the Commission (Fifty-second Sitting, 26th July, 1907). It will be seen by the Declaration of the President, recorded on page 102 of the *Proces Verbaux*, that it has been agreed that if it should be found that any considerable amount of bountied sugar is contained in sugared products exported from Great Britain to contracting States, the Commission will have to decide by a vote of majority whether the circumstances are such as to necessitate the termination of the Convention on 1st September, 1911. There appeared to be no need to embody this understanding in the Additional Act. His Majesty's Government cannot be called upon to furnish certificates with regard to sugared products so long as the Convention is in force.

Foreign Legations at Teheran.

MR. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether there is a guard of Russian troops at the Russian Legation in Teheran, and, if so, what is their number; can he state whether any, and, if so, what, additions to the force are in contemplation; and what is the character and number of the force guarding the British Legation.

MR. J. A. PEASE: So far as my right hon. friend's information goes, there is a guard of fourteen Russian troops at the Russian Legation at Teheran, but he cannot absolutely vouch for the accuracy of this figure without inquiry of His Majesty's Legation at Teheran. The guard of His Majesty's Legation consists of eight mounted men of the Indian Army.

MR. LYNCH: Will the hon. Gentleman make inquiries as to the second part of the Question?

MR. J. A. PEASE: I will ask the Secretary of State if he is willing to do so.

MR. LYNCH: Has any change been made in the practice by which the Secretary of State was to attend the House on Mondays?

MR. J. A. PEASE: The arrangement was that my right hon. friend should be here on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

Unclaimed Dividends.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the unclaimed Government stock amounts to nearly £1,000,000 and unclaimed dividends on Government stock to £1,806,531; and whether, as the turnover in the banks is enormously greater than the turnover in Government stock, he will state on what grounds the Treasury officials have arrived at the calculation that the total receipts of the banks from similar sources in 200 years is only about £500,000.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I gave the precise figures for the unclaimed stock and the unclaimed dividend account in answer to a Question by the hon. Member on Tuesday last. With regard to the second part of the Question, I am afraid that the hon. Member has misapprehended the purport of an Answer given by me in the House on the 11th instant; £500,000 was the sum taken a few years ago to be the approximate amount of unclaimed balances in the hands of existing banks at that time. I have no means of estimating even approximately the amount of the unclaimed balances in the hands of the old-established private banks which have disappeared or have been absorbed, whose balances, together with the liabilities attaching to them, may have remained with the legal representatives of the banks which have disappeared.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Can the right hon. Gentleman now say what the Treasury officials estimate as the total amount of unclaimed balances now in the banks?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Speaking from memory, after perusing the estimates, there was one estimate of over £500,000 and another of over £750,000.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: How could the Treasury possibly arrive at these figures having regard to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman has already informed the House that the banks refused to give any information?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Of course we have made some inquiries. I cannot state exactly what the sources of our information are, but we have made inquiries in proper quarters, and these are the estimates which have been furnished to us. We have made no recent inquiries.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.): How long must the account be unoperated upon before it is classed as unclaimed?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I do not quite know what is the practice, but it is very well known and old-established. If the right hon. Gentleman desires, I will make inquiries.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): Has the attention of the right hon. Gentleman been drawn to the statement in the public Press by a Member of the Institute of Bankers, that the unclaimed balances in six banks amount to several millions sterling; and, secondly, does the right hon. Gentleman not think that the best way to solve the whole of this problem is to induce his colleagues to give facilities for the passage of my Bill?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I would rather the hon. Gentleman addressed the second part of his Question to the Prime Minister. I have not seen the statement in the Press referred to, but if anyone can give me information to lead me to believe that these balances are anything approximating the figure estimated by my hon. friend, I shall be very pleased to make further inquiries.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): Will the right hon. Gentleman extend his inquiries into the popular belief in the North that the great bulk of the premises occupied by the banks in Scotland have been erected by money out of unclaimed balances?

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: Has the right hon. Gentleman's attention been called to the statement made on behalf of the Post Office that the Post Office has obtained from unclaimed balances, and from postal orders not presented for payment, the amount which he alleged was obtained by all the banks in the country?

[No Answer was given.]

Mr. BOTTOMLEY: Does the right hon. Gentleman really think any inquiry of the bank can be effective unless backed by a statutory obligation?

*Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter of opinion.

Old-age Pensions.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if, in the calculation that 247,000 males and 323,000 females would probably become entitled to pensions under the Old-age Pensions Bill, any account has been taken of the number of males likely to be disqualified under Clause 3, subsection (*b*), of the Bill.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, Sir. The question is not one which admits of a precise mathematical answer.

Grant for the Unemployed.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is intended this year to ask for the sum of £200,000, or for any other sum, in connection with the Unemployed Workmen Act; if so, when he proposes to submit an Estimate to the House for this sum; and whether any provision was made in the Budget for this additional expenditure.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: This subject is still under consideration. No provision for a grant under the Unemployed Workmen Act was included in this year's Budget, or in the Budget of either of the two preceding years.

Mr. HAROLD COX pointed out that the margin for contingencies would not cover this item.

Metropolitan Police.

Mr. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the advisability of introducing into the Metropolitan Police Force the practice of granting good conduct stripes, after the fashion in vogue in the Army.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): This is purely a disciplinary matter, and may be left to the Commissioner. I may add that the Commissioner is always ready to recognise special merit or special services among his men.

Shipping Laws in the Channel Islands.

Sir W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what progress has been made in the assimilation of the law in regard to merchant shipping in the Channel Islands to that obtaining in this country, as the outcome of the conference held last summer with the insular authorities, at which a general agreement was arrived at as to the desirability of securing uniformity of legislation.

Mr. GLADSTONE: The result of the conference was the preparation by the Board of Trade of a draft Bill, which was communicated to the insular authorities in April last. The draft has since been under the consideration of those authorities with a view to the submission of proposals for legislation to the States of Jersey and Guernsey; and I hope that before long effective legislation will result.

Welsh Church Commission Report.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when it is expected that the Welsh Church Commission will issue their Report.

MR. GLADSTONE: The taking of evidence has been finished, and the Report is being drafted, but I am informed that the materials are voluminous, and the work must necessarily take some time. The Commission propose to sit at the end of July for preliminary consideration of the Report.

*MR. REES asked whether the promise of the introduction of a Disestablishment Bill for Wales next session was dependent on the production and consideration of the Report of the Commission in the interval.

MR. GLADSTONE said that was a separate Question, of which he thought the hon. Member should give him notice.

Dominoes in Public Houses.

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that it was decided in the case of R. *v.* Ashton (1852) that dominoes are a legal game in public-houses, and that most games combining skill and chance are by law allowed on licensed premises, provided that they are not played for money or money's worth; and whether in fact any regulations exist which justify police intervention to prevent anyone from playing such games under such conditions in London.

MR. GLADSTONE: Licence holders are prohibited from suffering any gaming or any unlawful game to be carried on upon their premises. The decided cases, including that mentioned by my hon. friend, show that some games are unlawful in themselves, and others are prohibited upon licensed premises when played for money, that is to say, when they involve "gaming." The case quoted decided that the game of dominoes is not an unlawful game, and that it may be played on licensed premises if not played for money. The Metropolitan police do not intervene unless gaming or the playing of unlawful games takes place.

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS: Is it then the case that there is already liberty to play dominoes in public-houses everywhere, including London?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, but not for money.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): Will my right hon. friend cause a copy of that Answer to be sent to the Leader of the Opposition, who has publicly complained that he is not allowed to play dominoes in public-houses?

[No Answer was returned.]

Railway Conferences.

MR. WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the statement of the Government of 19th February is still being adhered to with regard to the Railway Conference, or whether the Conference is now to be limited by any rigid terms of reference as to the scope of the inquiry.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): The position is still as stated by my predecessor on 19th February.

Westerhope School Site.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board, with reference to the land of about three-quarters of an acre, between Westerhope and North Warbottle, of which the annual value for rating purposes is about 27s. a year, and for which, to use it for school purposes, the Northumberland County Council recently paid about £698, or about 500 years' purchase on the annual value attributable to it for rating, whether the purchase on these terms had the approval of the Local Government Board; and whether the Local Government Board, or any other board responsible to Parliament, has advanced, or proposes to advance, the purchase money.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. MASTERMAN, West Ham, N.): The price of the land was settled by a local valuer, to whom the question was referred by agreement between the parties without a formal arbitration, and the cost of it was included in a loan which the Local Government Board sanctioned in March, 1907, for the provision of the school. The county council have borrowed the money by the issue of debentures, and it will not be advanced by any Public Department.

Milk Bill.

Mr. E. A. STRAUSS (Berkshire, Abingdon): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can inform the House whether his Milk Bill is yet framed, and when he will introduce it.

Mr. MASTERMAN: The Bill is being prepared, but I cannot at present fix a date for its introduction.

Dangers of the Telephone.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to a Report by Dr. Francis J. Allan, medical officer of Westminster, with reference to the presence of disease germs in telephone mouthpieces; and whether any steps are taken to disinfect telephones at public call offices under the control of the Post Office.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): My attention has been called to the statement by Dr. Allan, which was not communicated to the Post Office, but was published in *The Lancet*. No trace of disease germs appears to have been found on five out of the six call office telephones tested by Dr. Allan, and the circumstances with regard to the sixth instrument, which is understood to be one in use at a railway station, appear to be quite exceptional. A special inquiry, as regards the possible spread of infection by call office telephones, was made three years ago by the city medical officer of health, and a considerable number of call office telephones were tested, with the result that they were found to be free from disease germs. Steps are taken for regularly cleansing the telephones in public call offices, and suggestions for an improved method of disinfection are under consideration. The whole matter is under careful observation.

Mr. LONSDALE: asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that certain eminent medical authorities were of opinion that, in the absence of disinfection, tuberculosis and diphtheria might be transmitted by the mouthpieces.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: They are disinfected; and we are considering whether we cannot have a better method of disinfecting. I shall be very glad to receive any communication from any medical officer who has views on the subject.

House of Commons Police.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if he can state how many hours police officers have to stand about the precincts of the House; and whether, in view of the fatigue involved, he could provide a certain number of seats for these officers.

The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale): The hours of the police in the House of Commons are under the control of the authorities of the House and the Home Secretary. They vary according to the necessities of business and the length of the sitting, but are much shorter than they used to be before the operation of the new rules governing procedure. I should be very glad if at any time I could see my way to alleviate the fatigue which is necessarily involved by the duties they so admirably perform.

London University.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Leicester, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he is now in a position to state how long he proposes to allow the present relations between the London University and the Imperial School of Science and Technology to exist without the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the former; and whether he can inform the House if the Board of Education has any policy to announce regarding the future government of the latter institution.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): No, Sir; the Imperial College has not yet had a complete academic year on its new foundation; the new governing body, who have only been a few months in office, have been very strenuously occupied by the various labours incident to the new developments, and the new post of rector of the college has only recently been filled. For these reasons the relations of the college to the London University, which have been uniformly harmonious, have not yet been sufficiently investigated or tested to admit of my coming to any decision at present as to the desirability of a Royal Commission. I understand, however, that there is some likelihood that, as was suggested last year to my predecessor, the London University may decide to apply for a Royal Commission to be appointed; and I think it would, therefore, be inexpedient that I should at the present stage attempt any statement in regard to the concluding paragraph of my hon. friend's Question.

SIR W. J. COLLINS asked whether the right hon. Gentleman endorsed the statement made by his predecessor in office to the effect that no steps should be taken by the Government to set up such a Royal Commission unless the chief parties concerned, the University and the college, should move the Government to do so.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he would like to have an opportunity of seeing what his predecessor said, but he had no doubt that that would be the most correct position to take up.

St. Anne's Secondary School, Southampton.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that out of 132 pupils in the St. Anne's secondary day school at Southampton, 95 are eligible for grants, and that 54 out of the 95 are Catholics; that the total number of Catholics in the school is 69; and whether in view of the minimum number of students required by Article 31 of the new Regulations, can he state what is the number of Catholic students required in order that the Board may recognise it as a secondary day school and accord it the higher grants.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The figures quoted do not entirely coincide with those in the possession of the Board, but I am to receive a deputation from the local education authority to-morrow, who will, no doubt, be able to give me the latest statistics available. The eligibility of a school for the receipt of the higher grant depends upon many considerations, which are set forth in the Regulations. I certainly am not in a position to say that any specific number of Catholic scholars would entitle any school to the higher grant or to a waiver of the Regulations.

MR. BOLAND: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that this particular Catholic school welcomed Protestant children, and is that fact to be allowed to act as a bar to its receiving the higher grant?

MR. RUNCIMAN: That is not the reason why the higher grant is not given. There are numerous reasons.

MR. BOLAND: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman apply the same arrangement as to the case of the training colleges?

MR. RUNCIMAN: The two things are entirely separate. I am going into the whole thing to-morrow, and may be able to give the hon. Member further information later in the week.

Education Code of Regulations.

MR. G. GOOCH (Bath): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can state when the Code of Regulations now laid upon the Table will be in the hands of Members.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I understand that copies will be delivered by the printers to-morrow.

Small Holdings.

MR. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board intends to issue to the county councils a circular pointing out the urgent necessity that schemes should be submitted to the Board by the end of July at latest.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD Strachey, Somersetshire, S.): The Commissioners are in constant communication with the county councils, and will do all that they can to expedite the preparation of schemes. We do not think that the issue of a circular and the prescription of a date as proposed would really assist the object which my hon. friend has in view.

MR. BENNETT: Is not the Board of Agriculture of opinion that seven months is a long enough period to formulate a scheme?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I have already stated it is impossible to fix a date. The hon. Member may be perfectly certain that the Board of Agriculture is anxious to expedite schemes.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): What is a scheme? Does it necessarily apply to all the applications received by a county council, or might a county council issue separate schemes for separate parts of their area?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY was understood to reply that the practice was to bring up a scheme for a particular area where it was desired to apply the Act.

MR. BENNETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, how many schemes have by this time been received from county councils by the Board of Agriculture; and whether, in these schemes, any definite proposals have been made for giving notice next Michaelmas to any landowners or tenants for any land.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Fifteen schemes have been received by the Board, of which one has been confirmed, nine provisionally approved, and five are now under consideration. The land comprised in these schemes has all been obtained by the councils by voluntary agreement, and so far as the Board are aware no notice has as yet been given with a view to its acquisition by compulsion.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, Barkston Ash): Has there been any difficulty in obtaining land under the scheme?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I cannot answer that Question without notice.

Credit Banks for Small Holdings.

MR. BENNETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether it is the intention of the Board of Agriculture to urge upon county councils the importance of establishing credit banks for the benefit of honest and deserving applicants whose capital may be regarded by the local authority as inadequate.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board recognise the importance of this subject, but county councils have no power to establish credit banks. Work of the kind can be more effectively done by such a body as the Agricultural Organisation Society, to whom the Board hope to be able to make a grant out of the Small Holdings Account for this and other purposes.

Houses on Small Holdings.

MR. BENNETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in any of the schemes forwarded from county councils, any mention whatever is made of the erection of houses or buildings on small holdings.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes, in several of them. I may mention, for example, that the Gloucestershire County Council propose to spend £1,000 on the adaptation of land, including the erection of a new cottage and alterations to existing buildings, and that the Radnor County Council propose to spend £250 for a similar purpose.

Appeals against Refusals of Small Holdings.

MR. BENNETT: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether any applicant who is refused land by a county council has the right of appeal to the Board of Agriculture.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: No specific right of appeal is given by the

Act, but the Board will take into consideration any representations which they may receive.

MR. MORRELL: Has any applicant who is refused land by a county council the right of appeal to the Board of Agriculture?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: No specific right of appeal is given by the Act, but the Board will take into consideration any representations which they may receive.

MR. MORRELL: Is it not the duty of the Small Holdings Commission to see the applicant gets the land?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: It is their duty to see that all applications are considered.

Returns of Applications.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that under the present procedure of the Commissioners their information as to the extent of the demand for small holdings is necessarily incorrect; and whether he will instruct the Commissioners to require all county councils to send a return every month of the applications which they receive, so that there may be a complete register of the demand made for land under this Act.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board have no reason to suppose that the information received as to the extent of the demand for small holdings is incorrect. The suggestion of my hon. friend will be kept in view.

MR. MORRELL: But is it not impossible for the Commission to ascertain the demand unless they get regular returns from the county councils?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Commission are in constant communication with the local authorities.

Equipment of Small Holdings.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, in view of the fact that at present county councils are under no obligation to provide proper equipment for a small holding or to erect a house upon it, the Government will consider the advisability of so amending the law that the Board may require the councils to do this wherever it is shown to be necessary; and whether, in the meantime, the Board will issue a Circular urging all councils to exercise in suitable cases the powers which they now have.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board have no evidence to show that county councils are likely to be unwilling to provide proper equipment for small holdings where the circumstances require it, and the Board do not think that any useful purpose would be served by the issue of a Circular Letter on the subject. It is much too early to contemplate the amendment of the Act, but we shall see that it has a fair trial.

Small Holdings Act—Exercise of Powers under Clause 16

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Small Holdings Commissioners have as yet taken any steps to exercise the powers conferred upon them of providing small holdings in any locality, under Clause 16 of the Act; whether their attention has been called to the successful experiments of this kind recently carried out by the Government in Hungary with practically no cost to the State; and whether, in view of the fact that the councils of several counties show considerable reluctance to administer the Act, they will consider the advisability of establishing experimental holdings in various parts of this country, as the Act allows.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The action taken by the President of the Board as a Commissioner of Woods, as to which full information will be given in his forthcoming Annual Report for 1907–8, has sufficiently demonstrated the feasibility of the establishment of small holdings, and the Board do not think it is necessary for them, at any rate at present, to take any action under the enactment to which my hon. friend refers. They do not agree that several counties show considerable reluctance to administer the Act. The Board are aware that the provision of small holdings is engaging the attention of the Agricultural Department in Hungary, but they have as yet received no definite information as to any successful experiments recently carried out in that country. Inquiries on the subject will be made.

Small Holdings—Provisions against Delay in the Preparation of Schemes.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board, in the case of any county as to which the Commissioners report that a demand exists but that the council of that county has not yet fixed a date for the preparation of a scheme dealing with the applications then received, will consider the advisability of at once requiring the council, under Clause 3 of the Act, to prepare a scheme, so that the actual acquisition of the land may not be indefinitely delayed.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: In the case of any unreasonable delay on the part of a county council in the preparation of a scheme, action will be taken on the lines suggested.

Strawberries on the Terrace.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Mid. Derbyshire, as Chairman of the Kitchen Committee, what was the market price per pound of strawberries in London last week; what was the price per pound paid by the Kitchen Committee; and what is the price per pound charged by the Kitchen Committee for strawberries when served on the Terrace.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE KITCHEN COMMITTEE (Sir JAMES JACOBY, Derbyshire, Mid.): The charge for a portion of strawberries served on the Terrace, large enough for two, including cream and sugar is 1s., or 6d. per head. The market price varies according to size and quality. The Kitchen Committee purchase best and selected fruit for which they pay 8d. per pound. From to-day the change of 1s. per portion is reduced to 8d.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I hear with entire satisfaction the reduction which is to be made in the price, but will the hon. Gentleman see that in future the staff act in a different way from what they did last week, when I heard complaints from four hon. Members that they were charged more than 2d. for each strawberry?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: They are almost as dear as peerages.

SIR JAMES JACOBY: The Committee are unable to form any opinion in regard to charges unless Members back their bills with their complaints, which then receive immediate attention.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I failed to get them to back their bills. One was a member of the Kitchen Committee.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the hon. Gentleman bear in mind that many people have a constitutional objection to backing bills?

SIR JAMES JACOBY: We have followed the constitutional procedure of our predecessors in this matter.

Education (Scotland) Bill.

*MR. LAMONT: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, under Clause 9, subsection (1), as amended, of the Education (Scotland) Bill, a school board in a Gaelic-speaking district would be obliged to comply with a petition of thirty ratepayers and make provision of continuation classes for instruction in the Gaelic language.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): No; in terms of the clause as amended the final decision in this matter would rest with the school board.

Bay of Firth Oyster Fisheries.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, as representing the

Scottish Fishery Board, whether the oyster fisheries at the Bay of Firth have been the subject of any Order by the Fishery Board.

I beg also to ask the Secretary for Scotland, as representing the Scottish Fishery Board, what action, if any, has been taken by the Board to improve the condition of the oyster beds in the Bay of Firth, Orkney.

MR. SINCLAIR: I may inform the hon. Member that an Order has been made for the establishment and maintenance of an oyster fishery at the Bay of Firth with a view to an improvement of the beds, and that the Order awaits confirmation by Parliament.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE: Has any action been previously taken to preserve these fisheries?

MR. SINCLAIR: Yes, there have been earlier efforts, but this is the first time they have arrived at a definite stage.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, with reference to the rights of oyster fishery over the area of about 4,500 acres of territorial water at the Bay of Firth, in the County of Orkney, which it is proposed by the Oyster and Mussel Fishery (Bay of Firth) Provisional Order Confirmation Bill to constitute as a several oyster fishery for a private fishery syndicate for a period of sixty years, whether the public has hitherto had the right of oyster fishery over that area; what, if any, rent the syndicate is to pay; what, if any, obligations the syndicate is under as to laying down spawn or otherwise incurring expenditure in the improvement of the fishery; what, if any, guarantees the syndicate gives that at the end of the sixty years the fishery will be left in a satisfactory condition; and what, if any, are the precedents for handing over a public right of oyster fishery in Scottish territorial waters to a private syndicate under similar conditions.

MR. SINCLAIR: (1) The right of taking oysters and mussels is *inter regalia*, and forms part of the *patrimonium principis*, or hereditary revenues of the Crown. In other words, the right is personal to the Sovereign, and the fishings are not held by him merely for the benefit and enjoyment of the lieges in the same manner as the other public rights of the people. In practice, it is true that fishermen took oysters from the Bay of Firth for many years to such an extent that the beds were almost entirely depleted, and for the last few years only two or three fishermen have occasionally fished for oysters in the bay. It is with the view of resuscitating the beds and preventing their extinction, and so giving employment to a considerable number of local fishermen, that a syndicate was formed. (2) The rent is progressive, from £5 to £12. (3) and (4) It is obviously in the interests of the syndicate to make every effort to lay down spawn, and otherwise improve the fishery, with the view of obtaining a return for their capital outlay. Further, Section 45 of the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, provides for the determination of the Order if the beds are not properly cultivated, and the promoters could not leave the beds in a less satisfactory state than they found them. (5) There are a number of instances of the grant of oyster fisheries under an Order. So far as Scotland is concerned, eight have been granted since the passing of the 1868 Act in the Firth of Forth and in various West Coast lochs.

Conviction of a Clyde Pilot.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I have been asked to defer this following Question, and I am sorry it should be so, as I should have liked the Answer before the Congress of Pilots meets to-morrow: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been drawn to a trial at Glasgow on 15th May last before the Sheriff of the county of Lanark, in which a Clyde pilot was charged under the Merchant Shipping Acts and convicted of negligently navigating a ship he was piloting so as to cause an alleged risk of collision with H.M.S. "Harrier" and danger to the lives of those on board the vessels; whether he will take into consideration the exceptional circumstances (in particular that, although this matter involved the exercise of the best practical seamanship in its decision, it was decided by the sheriff, who did not possess any nautical knowledge whatever and was without assistance from anyone who had such knowledge, and that before the trial the pilot had been examined as to the occurrence by the Clyde Pilotage Board, by whom he was licensed, and had been exonerated from all blame in the matter); and whether he will, in view of the circumstances of the case and of the fact that the Criminal Appeal Act does not extend to Scotland, take steps to secure a reconsideration of the case, with the assistance of nautical assessors.

MR. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend may rest assured that so far as the position of the man is concerned it will not be prejudiced by the delay, which is entirely due to the desire to get fuller information.

Poor Rates in the Lewis.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the rise in the poor rates levied in the parishes of Barvas, Uig, and Lochs, in the Lewis, from 2s. 11d., 2s. 3d., and 4s. 2d., respectively, per £ of rental in 1885 (inclusive of the public health rate) to 13s. 8d., 7s., and 12s. 3d., in 1907 (exclusive of the public health rate); whether he is aware that these rates compare with an average for Scotland of 11½d. per £ in the latter year, that the total local rates in these parishes amount to 17s. 9d., 16s. 3d., and 15s. 11d. per £ and that 80 per cent. of these rates is chargeable to one individual; and, seeing that, owing to £19,000 of arrears of his judicial rent and the payment thereon of the full local rates, he finds himself unable to pay the present year's demand note, with the result that a complete breakdown in local government there has occurred, will he state what steps he is taking in these circumstances to provide for its maintenance.

MR. SINCLAIR: So far as I am informed the hon. Member's figures as to the amounts of the rates in the parishes named are correct, and I accept his statement as to arrears of rent. In order to meet the immediate necessities of poor relief I have authorised certain payments in advance of grants-in-aid, not under ordinary circumstances payable till later in the year. Further action is under consideration.

Clonakilty Evicted Tenants.

MR. E. BARRY (Cork County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether inquiries have recently been instituted into the claims for reinstatement made by the representative of the late Patrick Donovan, evicted tenant, of Castleventry, Clonakilty; whether this farm has been vacant for a number of years; and, if so, what is the cause of the delay in reinstating the representative of Patrick Donovan in this holding.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have referred this case to their inspector for inquiry and report as to whether it is possible to make provision for the evicted tenant or his representative. The inspector's report will be considered as soon as it is received.

Glenflesk Evicted Tenant.

MR. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps the Estates Commissioners propose to take to assist Jeremiah Healy, who has now been reinstated in his farm at Foiladoun, Glenflesk, County Kerry; and will he impress on the Commissioners the necessity of dealing with this and similar cases effectively and at once, instead of allowing a considerable period of time to elapse and large sums of money to be spent on repeated inspections which seem to lead to no result.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received no application whatever in this case. If any application should be made to them they will, I have no doubt, deal with it upon its merits.

Extra Police at Newry.

MR. MOONEY (Newry): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state why a large contingent of extra police was drafted into Newry on Sunday, 21st June, on the occasion of a visit of the Ancient Order of Hibernians from some of the neighbouring towns; can he state on whose initiative these extra police were employed; was any local magistrate or magistrates consulted as to the necessity for such action; whether he is aware that the urban council, representative of every shade of opinion, are strongly of opinion that there was no necessity for this extra force; can he state what was the cost of these police; and upon whom it is intended to throw such cost.

MR. BIRRELL: On the occasion in question several thousand members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, wearing regalia and accompanied by eleven bands, paraded through the town of Newry. An extra force of seventy-five police was assembled at the instance of the police authorities, who are responsible for the maintenance of order and the preservation of the peace. No local magistrate was consulted, it is not customary for the police authorities to consult local magistrates as to the measures to be taken for preserving the peace on the occasion of party demonstrations. I understand that some members of the urban council have expressed the opinion that the extra force was unnecessary. Out of the seventy-five men referred to thirty were brought from other counties, and the sum of £5 14s. 10d., being a moiety of the cost of these men, is chargeable on the county at large. The remaining forty-five men belonged to the established county force, and in respect of these no charge is leviable.

MR. MOONEY: Is not a charge to be made on the urban area?

MR. BIRRELL: The charge will be made on the county at large.

Irish Education Grant.

MR. J. MURPHY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the teachers of schools with an average under thirty-five are excluded from any participation in the additional grant for primary education in Ireland; whether this exclusion has been carried out by the Treasury against the protest of the Commissioners of National Education, the executive of the National Teachers' Organisation, the associations of managers, and the Irish Government; and whether, having regard to the position of many of these schools in remote districts, where it is impossible to effect either an increased average or amalgamation, he will reconsider the allocation with the view of assisting a number of the poorest teachers in Ireland, who teach among sections of the people who would be otherwise unprovided for.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have nothing to add to the answer given by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury on Friday last to a similar Question by the hon. Member.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to a Supplementary Estimate for public education in Ireland amounting to £114,000; and whether any provision was made in the Budget for this additional expenditure.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: No express provision was made for this service in the Budget, which, however, included a margin for contingencies of £241,000

Greystones Harbour.

MR. MULDOON (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Board of Works in Ireland have inspected and reported upon the condition of Greystones Harbour; whether the piers are in a most dangerous condition; and what steps it is proposed to take to remedy the defects.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol E.): I beg to refer the hon. Member to the replies given to Questions on this subject on 11th March, 1907, and 5th December, 1906, to which I have nothing to add.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the hon. Gentleman be kind enough to direct attention to this harbour? Seeing that this is one of the most flourishing resorts in Ireland, cannot he stretch a point and put the harbour—which is now an absolute ruin—in proper repair.

MR. HOBHOUSE made no Answer.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I think I might have a reply. It generally saves a lot of time to answer my Questions.

MR. HOBHOUSE: It is not an easy matter always to answer on the spur of the moment. I was looking through previous Answers. A Committee which inquired into this matter wished its engineer to prepare a scheme for the improvement of the harbour, with a view to getting a free grant from the Government. But I am afraid we are not in a position to give one, there are so many who desire free grants.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): You will not give us a loan, much less a free grant.

Army Estimates.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can state when the Clothing Vote of the Army Estimates will be taken; and whether an opportunity will be afforded for the discussion of the same.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): As the hon. Member is aware, four days have already been devoted to the Army Estimates, and in view of this fact and of the time demanded and required for this discussion of other Votes, I cannot hold out any prospect of another day being given up to Army Estimates unless there is a general demand from the House.

Duration of Speeches.

MR. CLELAND: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is prepared to consider the advisability of introducing a new Standing Order providing a time limit for speeches in Standing Committees.

MR. ASQUITH: I shall be glad to consider any representations based on experience which my hon. friend or others may make to me on this subject.

Sunday Trading.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce during this session of Parliament a Bill relating to Sunday trading.

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir. It has been announced in another place that the Government cannot deal with this subject either by introducing a Bill themselves, or by giving facilities to a Private Member's Bill during the present session.

Scottish Estimates.

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if a second day can be given for the discussion of Scottish Estimates.

MR. SUTHERLAND (Elgin Burghs): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of Thursday's sitting being almost exclusively taken up with a discussion of one subject under the Scottish Estimates, an opportunity will be given for the discussion of the Scottish Fishery Board Vote.

MR. ASQUITH: Having regard to the fact that on Thursday last the whole sitting was devoted to the consideration of only one subject on the Scottish Estimates, I am prepared to consider whether half a day can be given between now and the end of July for the discussion of Scottish Estimates.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.

SIR JAMES JACOBY: May I ask when the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill will again be taken?

MR. ASQUITH said it was proposed to resume the Second Reading debate on this Bill on Monday next, and to conclude it on the same night at eight o'clock.

Birthday Honours.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked if it could be arranged, as a matter of general convenience, and so that their colleagues might know how to address them with becoming respect, that rosettes might be worn for at least one month from this date by the many hon. Gentlemen opposite who had joined the titled classes.

[No Answer was returned.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following

Member from Standing Committee A. (in respect of the University of Durham Bill): Mr. Verney; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Burnyeat.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILL.

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND BILL.

"To provide for the technical Education, Employment, and Maintenance of the Blind," presented by Mr. Steadman; supported by Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Clynes, Mr. Fenwick, and Mr. John Ward; to be read a second time upon Friday, 17th July, and to be printed. [Bill 286.]

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 3:

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) moved to leave out in subsection (1) (*a*) the words "such parochial or other," with a view to the insertion afterwards of different words to make the disqualification apply to receipt of "any poor relief at the expense of the rates other than relief" to be excepted by subsequent amendments. He said that there was some doubt as to what the words "or other relief" might imply. Several hon. Members were under the misapprehension that those words might apply to charity or alms, but the clause was simply intended to disqualify those who were in receipt of poor relief, and in order to make it quite clear he moved his Amendment.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) asked whether "poor" was not rather a new term. It had generally been "Poor Law" relief. Was it quite certain that the term "poor relief" would exclude all the various complications which had arisen under the Registration Act, which made it doubtful as to what was covered by "poor relief"?

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 10, to leave out the words 'such parochial or other' and to insert the word 'poor.'"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the words as they stood certainly would not suffice, but he had on the Paper other Amendments which would cover the cases raised by the hon. Member. The words as they stood certainly would not deal effectively and conclusively with the difficulties which have arisen under the Registration Law, and that was why he proposed to move a series of amendments later on.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) asked why the right hon. Gentleman said "poor relief" instead of "parochial relief." "Poor relief" was surely not a common way of referring to it; it should be "parochial relief."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had to take the experts' advice on technical terms of that kind, and he was advised that those words would really cover all the cases. There was some doubt as to the interpretation of the word "relief" in the Bill, but "poor relief" would certainly confine it to the cases they intended to exclude.

Mr. W. R. REA (Scarborough) asked if they were quite sure that all descriptions of medical relief were excluded.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE asked the hon. Member to postpone that point until they came to his next Amendment, which specifically raised that point.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) asked why the words "or other" were ever put in the Bill. He presumed they were put in for some reason.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said they had nothing to do with the law of this country, but they were told that these words were necessary in order to cover some law in Scotland and elsewhere.

That was really why they were put in, but his Amendment would cover both the Scottish case and the Welsh case.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Question proposed, "That the word 'poor' be there inserted."

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) moved as an Amendment to the Amendment, to insert the word "indoor" before "poor," because they had never yet had any explanation from the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill what was the difference in principle between outdoor relief paid out of the rates and 5s. a week paid out of the taxes in respect of old-age pensions. It appeared to him that they were exactly alike. They heard a great deal about the stigma of pauperism, but it seemed to him that if there was any stigma of pauperism in receiving 3s. 6d. a week out of the rates there must be just as much, or rather more, in receiving 5s. a week out of the taxes. The only possible argument that he could see on the other side was that people might feel that in taking money out of the rates they were taking money from their own neighbours. Was there no hardship in the case of an unmarried man, or a widow, or a man who had been in bad health and had the greatest difficulty in keeping himself from having recourse to the rates, when he at the age of 69 went and received Poor Law relief, and then this Bill came in he found he was not entitled to an old-age pension? Was there much difference between that man, in principle, and a man who might very likely have been in the enjoyment of a much better income and employment, and who managed, although he might not be nearly so thrifty or respectable, to hold on until seventy years old? What was the difference between those two cases? He knew the right hon. Gentleman had told them that that part of his proposal was merely experimental, and that in a very short time he hoped to be able to alter it. If there was any particular reason why that part of the Bill should be introduced and changed in a short time, he would like to know what it was, and why it was more important that that should be experimental than any other part of the Bill. A good many of these people, if it was going to be changed in two or three years, would be dead before they could get a chance of an old-age pension, and it seemed to him that that was where the greatest hardship came in. He supposed the next consideration on the other side would be the cost. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that the number of outdoor paupers over seventy years old was 200,000, and he did not know whether he was in a position to say what was the exact amount, or the average, that those 200,000 were getting in outdoor relief.

AN HON. MEMBER: Three shillings.

MR. BRIDGEMAN said that would make it 2s. more, and it would be £800,000 a year total expense. Considering the way in which the Government had embarked on this measure, surely a mere trifle of £800,000 more could not make much difference. Further, the right hon, Member for South Dublin had pointed out that this would be a diminishing cost, because in the future anyone who had not yet received poor relief would receive an old-age pension. It was a very strong argument in favour of his Amendment that in a few years this expense would merge entirely in the cost of the old-age pensions. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"Before the word 'poor,' to insert the word 'indoor.'"—(*Mr. Bridgeman.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'indoor' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was not sure that even if the financial arrangements permitted it the Government could accept this Amendment, because it would simply involve the transfer of 203,000 indoor paupers to the pension list. He did not think that that was the way to deal with this part of the Poor Law problem, which should be postponed until the pension scheme was out of the way. The hon. Gentleman had said that his Amendment would cost only a trifle of £800,000; but it was a very serious thing to propose to add £800,000 to the already heavy burden of financing a scheme of this kind. It was not possible at the present moment. He thought that, roughly speaking, there were between 200,000 and 210,000 indoor paupers, and that the proportion that would come within the scope of the disqualification would be 203,000 receiving an average of 3s. a week. But even if the relief were only 2s. the total cost would amount to over £1,000,000. Such a serious addition to the burden of the people could not possibly be considered during the present session.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer no doubt as the Bill progressed was beginning to find that the burden to be imposed on the taxpayer was much heavier than was frequently said would be the case when the Prime Minister first introduced the Bill. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to deal with details his only argument in reply to criticisms was that no more money could be produced. That might be a very sound argument so far as the Members of this House were concerned; they contemplated the pleasure of going down a few weeks hence and telling their constituents that they had conferred an enormous benefit on some people; but the Bill would be examined and criticised by other people than those who sat in that Chamber, and by people who probably knew a good deal more of the way in which it would work out than the Members of that House. The argument of his hon. friend who moved the Amendment was that the people who were excluded from the benefits of the Bill by the receipt of indoor relief were in every particular, in regard to conduct, way of life, and necessity, in exactly the same position as those who were going to benefit by the Bill. The Government said they could not go further, and the same answer was made to every Amendment proposed. He would not be a party to wrecking the Bill or superimposing a burden which would lead to its abandonment; but in common justice to the House of Commons and to the people who really would be affected by the Bill, he must say that the Government ought to have thought it out before they brought it before Parliament. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them that there were 200,000 paupers in receipt of outdoor relief to the average amount of 3s. a week, and that he was waiting for a reform of the Poor Law to deal with these persons. Even the newest recruit in the House knew what was meant when the Government told them to wait for another session to complete their legislation. Governments were only human, and they knew that when the great part of one session was given up to one subject, it was rare that the same subject was dealt with in the following session. He did not think that that was a good excuse. Knowing as he did how complicated and difficult the Poor Law problem was, and that they were not sure that the Report of the Poor Law Commission would be in their hands in time, he thought that all these references to a reform of the Poor Law were—he would not say dishonest, for he would not use any phrase in an offensive sense—but he did not believe for a moment that the House would be able to approach the reform of the Poor Law next session. If that were the case, what would happen when this Bill passed into law and the pensions committee were called upon to grant pensions under it, if they granted double the amount of pension they were entitled by the Bill to give? What power was there of recovering the difference? Were they going to make the committee personally liable, or to prosecute them and make them refund the amount overpaid? If so, then the Government ought to say it in the Bill. And if they did they would get very few men to go on the pensions committee. It was unpleasant enough at present for boards of guardians to discriminate between outdoor and indoor relief, and even now they got very little support from Members of the House. The difficulties of the boards of guardians were very great now, but the difficulties of the pensions committee would be ten times greater. Nobody could be so foolish as to suppose that the complicated provisions of the Bill were going to become familiar to the villagers in the country districts before next year. But there would be scores and hundreds of persons over seventy years of age who would be applicants for pensions, but who would come under the Poor Law disqualification. Not only the pensions committee but hon. Gentlemen who had made speeches would have to deal with these applicants and justify their exclusion from the pension list. It would not be enough to say to these poor people that the money would not go round. Some reason would have to be given to justify the discrimination between two sets of people whose circumstances were exactly the same. He did not wonder that his hon. friend pressed his Amendment. He hoped he would press it, for he was bound to say that the Government in trying to make this discrimination were attempting the impossible. It would involve an injustice in no way mitigated by the fact that it would cease at the end of an indefinite time—when Parliament otherwise determined. It should be remembered what the condition of those was who applied for outdoor relief. They must have suffered acutely before applying, and the board of guardians would not have granted relief unless they were destitute. Those, however, were the people who would be excluded from receiving a pension by the Bill as it stood, and all the excuse that the Government gave was that they had no money.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said he had great pleasure in supporting the Amendment for the reasons stated by the mover and seconder. Outdoor relief was very largely given to deserving persons on the recommendation of the boards of guardians of the day The Chancellor of the Exchequer would remember that the Aberdare Commission recommended that—

> "Greater discrimination should be made between those respectable aged persons who become destitute and those whose destitution is distinctly in consequence of their own misconduct, and that outdoor relief should in such cases be given to those who can be shown to have been of good character, thrifty according to their opportunities and generally independent in early life."

Then the Local Government Board issued on 4th August, 1900, a circular to the boards of guardians drawing attention to the Report of the Aberdare Commission, in which they stated—

> "The Board consider that aged deserving persons should not be urged to enter the workhouse at all unless there is some cause which renders such a course necessary, such as infirmity of mind or body, or absence of house accommodation or of a suitable person to care for them, or some similar cause, but that they should be relieved by having adequate outdoor relief granted to them."

In many parts of the country boards of guardians had made a system of classification and distinguished between the deserving and undeserving poor—giving outdoor relief to the deserving poor judged according to their character and their antecedents, and excluding from outdoor relief the worthless and undeserving. The result of the Bill as it stood would be to exclude the deserving poor from the right to receive pensions and to give pensions to the undeserving. What justice was there in that? In his own district they had made a very elaborate system of classification both of indoor and outdoor paupers, and the chairman of the board of guardians made these remarks—

> "In Sheffield they had paid great attention to greater classification and had given outdoor relief only to people with good records. Under the Bill the people who had been excluded from relief would now all get old-age pensions, whilst the people who, through their good conduct, had received outdoor relief would be the worse off."

That was to say, the people who were undeserving got no outdoor relief. Under the Bill, therefore, the deserving people who received this relief would not receive pensions, which would be given to those who had been excluded. They would be rewarded if they did not come within the Chancellor of the Exchequer's class of wastrels. A great many would, no doubt, come within the classification, but a good many would not, although they would come within the class of unthrifty which the Bill did not exclude. It might be said that it was very difficult to discriminate, but from the Report of the Chaplin Committee it would be seen that evidence was brought forward by the Charity Commissioners and others to show there would be no such difficulty. Although he should support this Amendment he would have supported it more strongly had his hon. friend suggested some kind of authority which should discriminate between the people who had been given outdoor relief under these circumstances.

*SIR GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said the right hon. the Member for South Dublin never rose to speak on this Bill without referring to the applause the Liberal Party expected to receive in the country at the hands of the people who expected to benefit by the Bill. At the same time he argued that the provisions of the Bill were most unpopular. Under those circumstances the one argument might be left to answer the other. Those who would receive the benefits of the Bill were exceedingly thankful at the prospect of the pension which they knew would come to them on 1st January. When the Committee remembered that those persons aggregated 500,000, no one need be surprised at the gratitude they showed. He, however, felt very strongly that some effort should have been made to meet the case of the outdoor paupers. In the agricultural districts they covered a large number of the most deserving poor. He felt, on the other hand, that the House was much to blame for the position in which they found themselves in the matter. Hon. Members had been too keen to secure benefits to others who were better off than the labourers whom this provision would benefit to a great extent. It was quite true that many of the most needy and most deserving of our poor were those who were on outdoor relief at the present moment. A few weeks before the introduction of the Bill he had brought to his notice the case of a woman of eighty-four years of age, who was still working on the land, who had been refused outdoor relief because she preferred to earn her own living, but who, owing to illness a short time ago, was obliged to apply for outdoor relief. She was now in receipt of 3s. a week, of which she paid 1s. 6d. in rent, and this brave old woman would have no benefit under the Bill. Many persons were in that position, and every hon. Member would have been glad if they could have made provision for them. Many hon. Members regretted that the Committee had preferred to deal with the question of old couples than to get what assistance they could from the Government for these persons. He was himself in a great difficulty with regard to the Amendment, because he felt that the Government had done their best to meet the demands made upon them. Having distributed the surplus which he had, he was afraid his right hon. friend would be unable to meet this case this year. He hoped, however, in meeting the Amendment, his right hon. friend would be able to give some definite promise to deal with these outdoor pauper cases at the earliest opportunity. The feeling on the Ministerial side of the House was that the Committee had, to a great extent, committed itself in accepting the offer of his right hon. friend, but at the same time he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give a definite promise to help these people next year. The Committee, he feared, in their desire to get something more for those who had 10s., 12s., or 13s. a week, had consumed all the finances without touching a class which had nothing whatever and was dependent on outdoor relief and contributions from their families who too often robbed their own young children to maintain their aged parents. He had hoped that the Bill would have put an end to the unmerciful provisions of the Poor Law, but now he was afraid they would have to wait a little longer for that.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said that the spectacle of the hon. Member attempting to reconcile the passive pledge which he gave to the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day not to press any further demands upon him——

*SIR GEORGE WHITE: I never gave any such pledge.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said they still had in their minds the impression of what took place when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, excluding hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side, turned to his supporters behind him and said that if they would promise to be good boys in future and not ask for any further concessions from him, they should have their slice of cake. He did not know whether the hon. Member protested against such a bargain. Perhaps he would let the House know whether he only protested against it to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh."]

SIR GEORGE WHITE: Whatever I did, I have given no pledge to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the hon Member, at all events, was one of those who gave a tacit approval to the bargain proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and his attempt to reconcile his loyal adherence to that bargain with his interest as representing a large constituency was instructive, if it was not edifying. He should think the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not be too ready to follow the path the hon. Member invited him to follow. Let the Committee be careful how they gave pledges to do more before they knew their resources and saw the field that was opening up. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government would not meet with a rigid refusal all the Amendments to be moved; but they should not attempt to tide over present difficulties by making vague promises as to what they would do in the future out of resources they had not got. The right hon. Gentleman had now given away all his surplus, and what they were now dealing with was a deficit. The point they had arrived at was that if the Budget estimates were right and its proposals were voted as they were made, the year would end with a deficit instead of a surplus—that was to say, the Supplementary Estimates which the right hon. Gentleman had introduced had already imposed a heavier charge on the Exchequer than the small balance accounted for in the Budget Speech. He was quite willing when the Finance Bill was considered in Committee to revise the Budget proposals if the changes made in the Bill necessitated it, and he ventured to press on the Government the extreme hardship they would inflict by the particular words they were now considering. Most legislation of a penal or restrictive character had its action confined to the future, but this Bill had the peculiarity that its penal clauses were retroactive. It did not say that if a man after the passing of the Bill could not keep himself from the poorhouse he should not have a pension, but that if this year he accepted poor relief he should be disqualified from receiving a pension. The Bill went back to 1st January of this year, before the question came up before the lines on which it was to be formed were known, before the conditions which it embodied were published, probably before they were definitely decided in the minds of His Majesty's Government, and if a man had been unfortunate and received Poor Law relief, outdoor or indoor, between 1st January and the moment when the Bill was introduced he would be disqualified for ever from receiving a pension. That was a very hard thing. What had been said by his right hon. friend, by the mover of the Amendment, and by others, showed how hard was the case if they attempted to draw a rigid line against the receipt of outdoor relief under such conditions as those on which it was given by boards of guardians. It very hard that they should apply this condition retrospectively, but when it was applied to people who had no alternative he thought it was harder still. If the Government were not prepared to accept the whole of the proposals of his hon. friend, at least he would urge that in the case of those who had been selected for outdoor relief—and outdoor relief was almost entirely reserved for those whom the guardians considered most deserving—if they could keep clear of that relief by aid of the pension, their past misfortunes should be wiped out, and they should be given a free start on the pension. For his part, compromising for the moment, he would accept that. He had no right to speak for others; he spoke for himself in this matter. That was the special point he wished to press upon the Government; it was one which concerned a great number of very deserving people. He thought there would be a great sense of hardship, unless the Committee met their case in some way. When the Bill was in force, charities available for distribution among the poor would very likely be largely used to aid old people who were near the age of seventy to carry them on to that age, and private relief would be forthcoming from the same purpose. Before the Bill was brought in, there was no incentive or reason to carry them on to a particular age. It made a special case for this kind of relief prior to the time when the Bill would come into operation, and if the right hon. Gentleman could except from this depriving clause those who had no alternative, he thought it would do something to meet a real hardship. He pressed the point all the more because the ground on which the Government based their whole scheme was that people were to be entitled to the pension as of right. That being so, they had no ground for coupling the exercise of that right with arbitrary and illogical conditions. If it were a charitable gift, they might impose what conditions they liked; but when they were recognising the pension as a right, they should not make it dependent on arbitrary and illogical conditions.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am really rather surprised that the right hon. Gentleman, with his experience at the Treasury, should have put forward a suggestion of this kind. It is really a wilder proposal than that made by the hon. Member, and practically of the same nature. His suggestion was that the Treasury should find the difference between the amount which is now paid by the guardians and the 5s. allocated by the Bill. That is the minimum. What is the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman? He comes forward here and says: "Will you consent to the inclusion of those who, before the Act, were in receipt of Poor Law relief, and therefore had no alternative?" That means 200,000 people.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): £2,700,000.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I thank the hon. Baronet for being my ready reckoner for the moment. That sum of £2,700,000 is to be added at a stroke to the cost of the Bill. I cannot believe that the right hon. Gentleman if he were in my place now—and he cannot divest himself, if I may respectfully say so, of his experience at the Exchequer—would have recommended to his friends in the House the proposal that with a single stroke of the pen, without any consideration at all, they should add £2,700,000 to a Bill which already ranges from £6,000,000 next year up to £7,500,000. That is really accounted for, as the right hon. Gentleman himself has informed us, by the fact that he has not consulted his colleagues. I can well believe it. I do not think he has consulted himself, if I may say so. I am not going to take part in this kind of by-play between parties, by having a kind of auction as to who shall bid the highest. If the Committee will allow me, I will discuss this absolutely on its merits. What is the proposal? I had the privilege of sitting on two Committees which dealt with this problem. They were Committees appointed by the late Unionist Government. They both agreed that you should exclude paupers, and exclude not merely those who were in receipt for the time being, but all those who received any Poor Law relief for twenty years before the application. What is the difference? Taking the Chaplin Committee, and taking the other Committee on the Aged Pensioners Bill of the hon. Member for Worcester, the difference is this, as I put it to the House in reply to my right hon. friend last week: Under those proposals they excluded 420,000 persons; under the proposals of the Government we simply exclude 270,000—a difference of 150,000 persons whom we are including in our Bill, and who would have been excluded by every proposal which has ever been submitted to the House up to the present. I do not think that it is really fair to say that we are submitting harsh, cruel, and impossible proposals to the House of Commons. We rather regret that it is not possible to make them considerably wider, but we have gone as far as we prudently can for the moment, and we have gone better by 140,000 or 150,000 than any proposal submitted to the House before. Really, hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite should bear that in mind, and even the exigencies of Parliamentary controversy might have justified them in giving us that credit when they were criticising proposals of this kind, which are milder, I will not say than they proposed, because I was a party to them on both Committees, but milder than the proposals of both those Committees. Therefore, it is not a question of our going one better than they were going, but we are going better than any proposal subscribed to by any Member on both sides of the House. I agree that my hon. friend the Member for Northampton had a Bill which proposed a scheme of a more sweeping character.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): There was no disqualification whatever.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: But that was a scheme of a totally different character. I am referring to schemes of a more moderate, and, if my hon. friend will allow me to say so, of a more practical character, having regard to all the financial exigencies of the country, which have been submitted by both sides. I agree entirely with what the hon. Member for Sheffield has said. There is not a single hard case that he put which I do not accept and deplore. I think it is a very great pity that we cannot deal with all those cases. But, after all, this is not a Bill dealing with every hard case in the country. It is simply a Bill to deal with them as far as our financial resources for the moment will enable us to proceed. Then I hope we shall be able to extend it gradually. If I may say so about the hon. Member's speech, I think it was a very strong argument in favour of my industry test. You want to exclude the wastrel, and you say that the man who is receiving 3s. a week from the parish will be excluded, while he will see the wastrel and loafer at the age of seventy years getting 5s. a week. Therefore, I am strongly in favour of the industry test, which I supported on the Chaplin Committee, and I agree with the hon. Member to that extent. My hon. friend the Member for North-West Norfolk made an appeal to me. He wants to know whether, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, I have a nest egg. I have no nest eggs at all. I have got to rob somebody's hen roost next year. I am on the look-out which will be the easiest to get and where I shall be least punished, and where I shall get the most eggs, and, not only that, but where they can be most easily spared, which is another important qualification. I said to the House on Wednesday, for I was perfectly frank, that I knew exactly the limit to which we could go, and the House preferred to take it on married couples. You cannot have your cake, and eat it. The House consumed it on Wednesday, and there is nothing left. That is really the position. We really have not a sum of money with which to meet an exigency of this kind, and meet it in the only possible way in which I think it ought to be met. In the most moderate scheme of the hon. Member opposite, I do not mean it was moderate in his Amendment, but moderate in the speech with which he supported it, he suggested that the difference might be made up by the Exchequer. That would mean a million. But it is far better to deal with the whole question, and that is the view which the House took on Wednesday night. They prefer to deal with the whole problem. Then my hon. friend asks: Does this mean indefinitely postponing dealing with this question? My first answer to that is that the very construction of the clause makes it imperative upon the Exchequer to deal with the problem at the earliest possible moment. ["Why?"] Because the guardians necessarily will in future do their very best to keep men off the poor rate in order to transfer them to the pension fund. It is their duty. They are not merely the guardians of the poor, they are the guardians of the rates, and, therefore, they would naturally wish to transfer every destitute person to the care of the Exchequer. Not only that, but there would be a conspiracy with the poor person himself and his relatives to get on to the Excehquer fund, and gradually the number of outdoor paupers must necessarily diminish by the automatic operation of this disqualification. That is why I have always put this figure a little higher than £6,000,000. Therefore it is to the interests of the Exchequer to deal with the problem. But I do not at all mind making it perfectly clear on the face of the Bill itself that we have got to deal with it. The right hon. Gentleman opposite who was in charge of the Agricultural Rating Bill put in a provision of that kind which made it almost imperative on the Imperial Parliament to deal with the problem on a certain day.

Mr. WALTER LONG: They never have done, and it is six years ago.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Well, I know. But there is this distinction between that case and the present one, that it certainly is to the interest of the Exchequer in this case to deal with this, and I am not sure whether it is in the interest of the Exchequer to deal with the other problem, because the inevitable result of that would be that more money would come out of the Exchequer of the country for local purposes.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Would the right hon. Gentleman mind telling us how it is to the interest of the Exchequer? This Bill imposes limitations, and the right hon. Gentleman has recognised the difficulty in maintaining them. Those limitations being there, unless it is proposed to make them stricter still, I do not see what the Exchequer would gain by dealing with this matter in any other way than under this Bill.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I will tell the right hon. Gentleman, we have no absolutely reliable figures, but our estimate is that about 60,000 persons fall on the Poor Law after they reach seventy years of age. Well, in future they will not go to the parish; they will ask for a 5s. pension. But it is a little more than that, because all those who are approaching seventy will not go to the parish if they know that they will be excluded from the pension the moment they receive relief from the parish. The result will be that not 60,000 persons, but probably 80,000 persons per annum in the ordinary course will come straight on the pension fund. That is a very serious addition.

Mr. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): How many will die each year?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I know the effect of that would be still further to diminish the burdens on the parish, but it is those who come on who impose a burden on the Exchequer.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): What will be the net increase each year?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am allowing for that in my computation, but it is purely a computation. To that extent, at any rate, you diminish the burden on the poor-rate and you increase the burden on the pension fund. However, I am perfectly willing, if the House thinks it would be better, to fix a date which would make it incumbent upon Parliament at any rate to face it, because if you want to extend the term you would have a debate in Parliament, and that would be a statutory pledge that it would be dealt with. My own view—and that must be taken for what it is worth, because I do not profess to be in a position now to give any final decision—my own opinion is that you will be able to prepare financially next year to deal with the problem in the following year, but you would have to prepare financially next year. What is perfectly clear is that you cannot readjust your finance year by year for every contingency that arises. You have got to take a very wide view of the whole problem next year, and consider the problem of the Poor Law among others when you are arranging your finance. That, in my judgment, will probably mean that whereas you will arrange your finance next year with a view to dealing with the problem, you cannot deal with the problem itself effectively possibly till the following year. So you will have the best pledge in the world to deal with the problem—you will have a pledge next year of the provisions of finance. And, therefore, I would suggest to the House, if they prefer a statutory pledge, that they should accept one of the Amendments on the Paper in the name of one of my hon. friends for the substitution of the words "the 31st day of December, 1910." That would mean that the present disqualification should come to an end in 1910, instead of having the vague words "until Parliament otherwise determines." Parliament is anxious to deal with this problem, and should pledge itself, because there seems to be a desire on both sides of the House to deal with the problem of the pauper. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite are keen to deal with this problem.

[OPPOSITION cries of "Now."] Well, I thought there would be a little shrinking.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I was making an appeal for the people who became a charge upon the Poor Law for outdoor relief before they had notice of this Act. The right hon. Gentleman promised to revise the Act for the benefit of the pauper in 1910. Clearly that does not meet their case. Many of those old people may have ceased to live. Therefore, I am not shrinking from the offer he has made, but it is not addressed in the least to the argument I put before him.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I had already addressed myself to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He proposes to add £2,600,000 now. Really, it is such an impossible scheme that I do not think his colleagues will support him in a proposal of that kind. There are two problems—the problem of the kind of person you are going to introduce among the pensioners, and the problem of the relations between local and Imperial finance, because the hon. Member who has moved this Amendment knows perfectly well that you cannot deal with this problem without dealing with the problem of the relations of local and Imperial finance, and that is why he made the suggestion. It is impossible that you should do that at the present stage, and when you deal with a thing of that sort it is so much better to deal with it once for all. I make that suggestion to the House as a guarantee of the good faith of the Government that we are not really trying to exclude the paupers, but simply dealing with a temporary difficulty. We are awaiting the Report of the Poor Law Commission with a view of dealing with it in a thoroughly comprehensive fashion, and we have given the best guarantee by saying that next year we confidently hope to be able to make financial arrangements to deal with it, and before December, 1910, the whole operation will have been completed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): Everybody will admit that the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is one of the most important, if not the most important, which has been delivered in the course of our committee deliberations on this Bill. I am not sure whether it is not the most important speech delivered from the Government Bench on the Bill altogether. The right hon. Gentleman has announced the happy news that in future the Government mean to arrange their finance before they go into their liabilities. Without turning a hair, the right hon. Gentleman got up and said, as if it was the most obvious and natural thing in the world, that we had what was no doubt the prospect of a great reform of the Poor Law before us, and you cannot deal with these great reforms, involving great expenditure of money, unless you arranged your financial system so as to meet the liabilities imposed upon it. When did His Majesty's Government make this happy discovery? Have not we been earnestly pressing them during the Budget debate and during the earlier stages of this Committee not to ask us to discuss a Bill involving these enormous financial burdens without giving us some slight indication of how those financial burdens might be met? The only indication we have had up to the present time, either from the late Chancellor of the Exchequer or the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, is that when we see these proposals the best parallel to them will be that of a boy robbing a hen roost. It is upon that rather shadowy financial adumbration of the future that we have to make all our estimates as to what can and cannot properly be asked of the Government in dealing with this Bill. The Government in this matter are obviously wholly inconsistent, but I will congratulate them upon the fact that their new doctrine is incomparably better than their old doctrine, and that their future procedure in the matter of social reform and public finance, though directly opposed to their present system, is yet a great improvement. Let me deal with the proposal which the right hon. Gentleman made at the end of his speech. He said he would give us a guarantee of the good faith of the Government that they meant to deal with this problem, that they would put in words in the Bill limiting this clause to two and a half years, or some period of that kind. The right hon. Gentleman seems to suppose that in the meantime between this and 1910 there would not be this obligation thrown upon the Treasury, owing to the fact that the local authorities would try to substitute pensions for Poor Law relief in all possible cases. That process will begin at once, in fact it has begun. So that the Treasury are now undergoing this obligation without the reform of the Poor Law, and without any of those safeguards which the right hon. Gentleman thinks are necessary, and in two-and-a half years time the local authorities are going to dump upon the Exchequer all the obligations which the right hon. Gentleman says will be so onerous that Parliament and the Exchequer must deal with them not later than the end of 1910. They ought to deal with them now. Is not this another manifest proof, if proof were required, that this Bill has never been thought out, that it has been tossed to a sated country in order again to revive and whet their appetites for more Radical reforms? I do not ask now whether it is or is not successfully framed for performing that culinary operation. I confine myself now to asking whether that is the way we ought to legislate, and whether the straits in which the Government are placed do not prove that they ought to have formulated their Bill with far more care than they have manifestly given to it. The right hon. Gentleman appears to think that simply because there has been inconvenience, Parliament will be forced to legislate. To pass a Bill of this kind is not any security that Parliament will legislate, although it gives them an opportunity of dealing with it. It has been said that when Parliament deals with it there will be a great debate. I have heard that stated before in regard to the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. Let me point out another thing. The right hon. Gentleman says that this is a transition period. It is a transition period; but does he not remember that when we protested against excluding all contributory schemes the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Prime Minister turned round and said that the objection to all our contributory schemes was that they do not deal with a transition period? Does your scheme deal with it? It is the one thing which your scheme does not do. Who is it you ought most to assist during a transition period? It is the people who are in every respect on the same plane, with the same qualifications, the same rights to relief as the people your Bill proposes to deal with. You do not deal with them, and you do not deal with them on the ground that you have not sufficient money. I thought I never heard anything done better in this House than the Chancellor of the Exchequer's strategical, tactical movement to the rear on Wednesday last. I confess myself to being rather a connoisseur in these movements. I have watched them from both sides of the House. Successive Governments in thirty years have occasionally been in the position of trying to deal with what is obviously the general sense of the House, and it is not easy to carry out that tactical movement with dignity, good temper, and dexterity. The right hon. Gentleman showed all these three qualities. But the most he did was to get a kind of tacit pledge from a stunned body of friends behind him that, if he gave way upon the subject of married couples and old people living together, no further demands should be made upon him. That was admirably dexterous, because it was impossible for any one, except by calling out an occasional "No, no," to resist the kind of obligation which the right hon. Gentleman thrust upon them. And yet the Committee was not in a position to compare the sufferings of the old couples with the sufferings of the deserving poor whom you are going to exclude now. We had no comparative estimate of the kinds of demands that are going to be made for different classes of deserving persons excluded, for there were only ten minutes to lapse before the fatal moment when all discussion had to cease. I ask the House whether there could be a more tremendous commentary upon the whole method under which we are obliged to conduct our debates. One hon. Member has said that he thought if there was not enough money for all, it ought to go to the outdoor pauper. But how can the Committee be in a position even to consider this question properly? The consequence is that the Chancellor of the Exchequer now gets up, and in the name of finance asks us to reject an Amendment, the plain and manifest justice of which on his own showing is apparent. What are the Chancellor of the Exchequer's own principles upon which he relied on the Second Reading? He said that all those people were to get pensions who had earned them by a hard and laborious life spent for the benefit not merely of themselves, but of the community. Having so spent their lives, they had a right to a pension. We look at his Bill to find out how he carries out his plan. The right hon. Gentleman is as aware as anyone else that there has been a great effort made under the existing law to carry out something like a scheme of pensions by classification in many districts, and small outdoor pensions have been given under the name of relief for many years past. Do you hold that this outdoor relief, although in the nature of a pension, has the taint of the Poor Law, and is a degradation to the man who receives it? If so, that degradation you are going to insist upon his bearing for the natural term of his life. I have heard something about the popularity of this Bill; but it will produce a most bitter sense of injustice amongst a class which is specially deserving of our consideration, because the people of this class are, first, very old; secondly, very deserving; and thirdly, they have no votes. It will produce a bitter sense of injustice amongst them, and I do not think that can be denied from any quarter of the House. You have only to mention a case which occurs instinctively—namely, of two old labourers living in contiguous cottages, one a year younger than the other. The one is eligible and the other is not. There is no substantial distinction between the two, but the one has to remain under the taint of Poor Law relief while the other is an honourable pensioner of the State for services rendered. One of two things must happen. Either you will have this bittter sense of a differential treatment of people in almost identical circumstances, or you will make the general population feel that, after all, your pensions do not differ from outdoor relief. The man who, being qualified under your Bill, receives a pension of 5s., is really in nowise differently circumstanced from a man who receives 3s. from the guardians, except that 3s. is less than 5s. I think this is a very serious matter. The right hon. Gentleman does not meet the point of the accusation by saying he has not got the money. He gave away £3,500,000 from the sugar duties. Those £3,500,000 would have dealt with the old married couples and the hard cases under this Bill. I cannot conceive anything more amazing than the procedure of the Govenrment in this matter. They call this part of the general financial scheme of the year and treat it almost as part of the Budget. When discussing the Budget, they take £3,500,000 off the sugar duties, and that is met with loud cheers from hon. Members opposite. To each hard case which in turn is presented to them the Government say, "Your case is utterly hard and grossly unjust; the cruelty inflicted is undeniable; we would gladly ameliorate the suffering if we could, but we have spent all our money in taking off taxation, and we have not a shilling left to meet the unanswerable appeal you make to us." The Government have produced an old-age pension scheme which professes to give to certain classes of the community the right to a pension of 5s. a week, but on examination it is found not to do so; and when we ask for an explanation of this gross inconsistency between the doctrine the Government have preached and the Bill they have introduced we are told it is want of money—a want of money brought on themselves by the twin measure of the Bill which the House is now engaged in passing into law. The justice of the Amendment is admitted. The only answer to it is that the money is not forthcoming. We know it would be forthcoming if a single Amendment were made in the Finance Bill. That Bill is not yet passed. Therefore, as the justice of the Amendment is clear, and as a method of meeting it is obvious, I shall support my hon. friend if he goes to a division.

*Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said he found some difficulty in supporting the Amendment because, in its present form, it did not enable him and his friends to say exactly what they would like to do under the clause. They were not in favour of paying old-age pensions at the same time as Poor Law relief was being given, but the Amendment did involve that.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN said he did not think his Amendment involved that. What he said in his speech did not bear that interpretation.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said they were now discussing the disqualification clause. The clause said that a person should be disqualified for receiving an old-age pension, while he was in receipt of Poor Law relief. The Amendment proposed by the hon. Member was that they should not be disqualified in respect of receiving outdoor relief. That did not exactly express what he thought the Committee would like to vote upon. That was his point. He thought it would be convenient, in order to save the time of the Committee later on, to discuss the whole question now, and vote for or against the different Amendments as they arose later on. The Government admitted that everything that could be said in favour of paupers being included in an old-age pension scheme was just, but declared that they had not the necessary money. It raised the question whether any proposal, even as a beginning, for paying old-age pensions was satisfactory, which accepted the mere fact of pauperism as a disqualifying basis, and he thought the Committee ought to say "No." If they accepted this scheme which excluded paupers, they said in effect that there were certain people in this country who were too poor to benefit by an old-age pension scheme. When the Prime Minister was considering how much money he was going to spend on old-age pensions and how he was going to spend it, he ought to have been aware that it would violate most severely the sense of justice of the House if he placed before it a scheme which said that no pauper must apply for an old-age pension. The case was overwhelmingly in favour of the inclusion of the paupers. Had it not been for the melancholy picture of the aged and deserving paupers there probably would have been no agitation for old-age pensions. On every platform in the country the Labour Party made it their chief case for urging the payment of old-age pensions to old people of sixty-five and seventy years of age that by applying for pauper relief those persons lost their independence and their civic rights. A particularly bad case had been sent to him by the secretary of a distress committee. It concerned a woman, aged seventy-two years, whose husband, aged seventy-four, was a shoemaker, who had been unable to work for some years owing to rheumatism; the lady was strong and hearty, and had worked for two years prior to 1st June as a general servant, but had lost her work owing to a daughter of her employer coming to reside at home. Previous to this the lady was the cleaner of an office in the Inner Temple. Her character was satisfactory. Being unable to work the husband applied for parish relief, and had been for some years allowed 3s. a week with which he paid the rent. Those people would be disqualified for old-age pensions because the man had been in receipt of Poor Law relief. He felt certain that other Members could mention cases in which equal injustice would be done. It was no answer to their appeal for justice for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say that he had spent the money in other directions. As to the compromise arrived at on Wednesday, he and his friends on that side were no parties to it. Nor, as a matter of fact, had the Committee any opportunity of choosing one way or another. The proposal was made within a few minutes of the dropping of the guillotine. It was made under circumstances which made it absolutely impossible for the members of the Committee to make up their minds. Before the Committee knew where they were, they were committed, and now he thought it was not quite fair to bind the Committee to the arrangement come to when they had had no opportunity of saying whether they accepted the conditions or not. There was another important point which must not be overlooked. There were thousands of people who would be disqualified under the Bill, and who, had they had eighteen months or two years notice that such a measure was going to be introduced, would have been kept off the Poor Law altogether, and yet the Government warned those people whose condition had been the occasion of the proposal of old-age pensions that they were going to be disqualified by the very cruel and harsh provision the Committee were now discussing. Undoubtedly the two years' date, now proposed to be introduced, met them to a certain extent, but not altogether. There was no guarantee that they were to have this matter opened up again in 1910. It was perfectly simple to carry on the disqualification by methods which every Member knew. Moreover, what was going to happen to the existing paupers? Were the Government going deliberately and in cold blood to say to the pauper of seventy, seventy-one, and seventy-two: "You have got to die a pauper, and the benefits that are going to be derived under the Bill can only be derived by men and women two or three years younger than you." That proposal was too cruel for the Committee to entertain at all, and the right hon. Gentleman ought to have foreseen it before he drafted his Bill. It was no good to come to the House after the Bill had been drafted and say: "You have got to be cruel, because cruelty is necessary to keep you within the scope of the proposals I make." There was another point which he wished to make. It was said that, once this was passed, boards of guardians would do their best to refuse outdoor relief, and the poor people themselves, who valued their self-respect very highly, would pinch and starve for twelve months in order to save themselves from the pauper taint, so as to become eligible for old-age pensions at the proper time. Did the Committee contemplate what that meant? Was that a virtue after all? It meant that the sum total of human suffering for five years, from sixty-five to seventy years of age, was going to be increased as the result of the passing of this Bill. There were thousands of these people who were prepared to bring themselves almost to the brink of starvation rather than apply for pauper relief, and the Government were going to put inducements in their way to undergo that deprivation. They were going to pay a premium practically to the boards of guardians in the rural districts to administer the Poor Law more harshly than now. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] That was the effect of the Bill, and then the guardians were going to say: "We are not administering the Poor Law harshly; we are only trying to enable you to become beneficiaries under the Old-Age Pensions Act two or three years from now." Nobody who had experience of the administration of the Poor Law would deny that that would be the effect of the Bill. Was the Committee prepared seriously to face that situation and to pass this Bill saying that they were going to put this premium upon the harsh administration on the part of the boards of guardians only too prevalent at the present time? If this bargain, supposed to have been come to last Wednesday, but not come to at all with the Labour Party, was going to be held by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to be a binding bargain, would the right hon. Gentleman not give them a chance of expressing their opinions upon it? Were they going to be told that the increase of the pensions to married couples had barred out finally and effectually all claims of the existing pauper? The point was of sufficient gravity, in his opinion, not to force it through the Committee owing to the operation of the guillotine, without the Committee knowing what it was doing and without having made up its mind.

*THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale) said that the hon. Member was, quite intentionally of course, unfair to the Government in the way in which he had treated the pauper provision in the Bill. Over and over again it had been explained that that was merely a temporary provision, and the hon. Member spoke as if the Government intended the permanent exclusion of this class of paupers.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD said he would recall to the right hon. Gentleman's memory that he had dealt with the matter of the two years qualification.

*MR. HARCOURT said it had always been admitted that there were certain paupers—probably a large number—who might and should be included in this scheme in the future; but it was absolutely impossible to include them until the Government were able to deal with the whole question of the Poor Law. He was sorry the Poor Law Commission had not reported twelve months ago; for then, although the time would have been short enough, the Government might have been able to make the provisions of the Bill fit in with their action on the Report of that Commission. Meanwhile they were bound to wait and consider the Report. It was easy to raise a number of specific hard cases. In every proposal either for taxation or for a grant or gift where there was a limitation there must be hard cases on one side or the other of the line. The Leader of the Opposition did not see what pressure there would be on the Treasury to deal with this subject in the near future. There would be the pressure of an additional charge coming on the Treasury. The two and a half years offered by his right hon. friend was not the minimum time for dealing with this matter, but the maximum time; and at, or before, the expiration of two years the House would have the opportunity of dealing with this matter again. He asked the right hon. Gentleman how paupers could have been brought into the scheme at all if it had been on a contributory basis. The Amendment would throw all the existing outdoor paupers on to the pension fund at once.

MR. WALTER LONG: Subject to your subsequent limitations.

*MR. HARCOURT: Of course, subject to those limitations. They must go slow and postpone such a transaction as that until they could make an equitable arrangement with the local authorities which would be fair to the taxpayer and to all concerned. He would like to point out to hon. Members opposite that all previous schemes had been more severe on the paupers, excepting one referred to by the hon. Member for Northampton. It was an interesting fact that the Poor Law Union deputation introduced to the Chancellor of the Exchequer a few days ago by the hon. Member for Tewkesbury, while pressing for the sliding scale and the concession to married couples, were in perfect agreement with the Government as to the impossibility of touching the pauper question until they came to deal with the Poor Law Commission Report.

MR. WALTER LONG said he only wanted to say one word as to what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman in reply to the Leader of the Opposition. The right hon. Gentleman and the Government had entirely misunderstood the case put from that side of the House in regard to the operation of the Bill when passed. The right hon. Gentleman had repeated that the passing of the Bill without any of those exemptions imposed on the Treasury the obligation to deal with the reform of the Poor Law within a limited time. The contention of the Opposition was that the passing of the Bill in its present state would make it ten times more difficult to deal with the disqualifications later on than now. He asked the question of the First Commissioner of Works: Did the Government propose in their subsequent legislation to strengthen and tighten up the disqualifications at present in the Bill? The First Commissioner said that by the operation of every Bill there would be hard cases; but he was mistaken in saying that those hard cases would be exceptional under the Bill. In every agricultural village where there were six poor people, three on one side of the line would receive pensions, and three on the other side would be disqualified under this section, while there would not be one single detail in their life which would differentiate their condition. He admitted that where benefits were conferred there must be certain limits which would involve hard cases; but that did not apply to this legislation at all. In a country village of 500 people, the number of men and women over seventy years of age would be probably six or eight, one half of whom would come on the Poor Law during a hard winter, and the Government said to them under this section: "Until the reform of the Poor Law is accomplished you will get no pension, although the man next door gets one." He did not suppose that there was an agricultural village in the country where a man working for a landlord or a large employer would not be kept on out of charity during a hard frost, and another man working for a small employer would have no alternative under the same circumstances but to go to the board of guardians and get outdoor relief. The Government had no right to reproach the Opposition for raising this question now. He himself had raised it on the Second Reading, and in subsequent debates. They had held throughout that these limitations could not be maintained in practice or in justice. The Opposition had been no party to the bargain which had been made between the Government and their supporters, and they regretted that it had been made. They were bound to point out the effect of these limitations, that they could not be enforced and that even if they could, they could not be justified.

Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said that the Leader of the Opposition had made a bitter attack on the Government because they had not sufficient money to do everything. The position was that when the Government were elected they gave no pledges at all in regard to old-age pensions; whereas the Leader of the Opposition, who had been in power for ten years, had given pledges and yet had done nothing. So far as he understood, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given definite pledges with regard to this question of dealing with the pauper. He had given a Parliamentary pledge that he would deal with it if possible next session, and had shown how circumstances would, in all probability, drive the Government to do so. But even if the right hon. Gentleman were to be recalcitrant in that matter, he had also promised to give a statutory pledge, viz., that he would accept the Amendment substituting "1st December, 1910" for "until Parliament otherwise determines." Therefore, the Government ought not to be further urged in the matter. Of course, every one who lived in the country and knew the rural districts recognised the truth of every word which had been said about the hard and cruel cases which would arise. There must be hard and cruel cases in which people would be deprived of these old-age pensions; but it was peculiarly the privilege of the Liberal Party to look after these hard cases. [Opposition cries of "Oh, oh!"] The Liberal Party had always laid it down that one of the main items of their policy was to look after those who were not able to look after themselves. There was nothing dearer to the heart of the Liberal Party than this question of old-age relief. But let the Committee consider what the effect would be if this Amendment were accepted by the Government and they were to admit indoor and outdoor paupers, because, after all, they were now discussing the whole question. It would mean an addition of £3,500,000 to the cost of the scheme. He himself was a member of a board of guardians and he knew what he and his board would do under those circumstances. They would endeavour to put as many off the rates as they could, and put them on to the Exchequer. The people who would benefit then would be the ratepayers. It would be a large subvention to the rates. They had an example in the Agricultural Rates Act of who got the benefit of a large subvention to the rates. It ultimately went into the pockets of the landlords. If they did not deal with all these questions in the way the right hon. Gentleman proposed to deal with them next year the result would be to put a large sum into the pockets of the landlords, and that they had no desire to do. He, personally, wished the whole matter could be dealt with this session, but if it could not he was content that it should be dealt with next session. He submitted that the Committee should be satisfied with the Parliamentary and the statutory pledges given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. GOULDING (Worcester) said the Amendment was designed to protect those who could not protect themselves, and now the hon. Member who had just sat down had told the Committee that the Party opposite were the only people endowed with the will to do that. But the hon. Gentleman was not going to vote for the Amendment, because the people affected could not record their votes in the ballot boxes. He hoped the Amendment would be considered on its merits. It was no use saying that the intention of the Government was good, because the Committee knew where good intentions sometimes led. The Committee wanted these particular grievances dealt with on their merits. The First Commissioner of Works had for the first time given a new excuse for not dealing with these matters. The right hon. Gentleman said the Poor Law Commissioners would shortly report and the Government must wait until that Report was received before dealing with the matter. Up to now the only excuse that had come from the Treasury Bench was that the Government were short of cash, that their coffers were empty, but if they were full they would be desirous of dealing with all these questions. That was the ground on which the Government were attacked. They had no right to give away the £3,500,000 on sugar duty; they should have kept the money to deal with these cases. Right through the debate the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, before making any concessions whatever, that the concession he was most anxious to give effect to was to those disqualified by reason of their receiving Poor Law relief. Now when that question arose the right hon. Gentleman was not able to give any redress. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman not to close the door to some small redress to these people. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Shropshire claimed a concession for all in receipt of outdoor relief. That complicated the matter because it could not be asserted that all outdoor relief was given on the lines of selection, but it was a fact that outdoor relief was largely given to those who had endeavoured to live thrifty lives, and under the Bill those people would be excluded from receiving a pension. He had a case before him of some villages in Wiltshire, where there were twenty people who had belonged to friendly societies, paid into them for fifty-five or sixty years, and had started contributing to them when they were earning only 7s. a week. They had done everything they could to show their thrifty habits. The great friendly societies like the Oddfellows and the Foresters never came to their doors. Now, because the village clubs to which they had subscribed had broken up, and these men could not begin to subscribe to other friendly societies, being by age precluded from joining them, though they had done everything possible to provide for their old age and be placed in the category of deserving citizens they were to suffer this great injustice. Surely the pension committee should consider and make an exception in such cases. He begged the right hon. Gentleman to consider, before the Committee came to a decision, some way in which he could give relief to this class of persons. The cost would not amount to more than £200,000.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said the hon. Member for Leicester had stated that the mere fact of pauperism ought not to be raised as a disqualification, and had also referred to the fact that previous schemes contained the same idea. He himself had formulated the first Bill of this kind, and that Bill arose out of one that proposed to give pensions to deserving persons in receipt of Poor Law relief. From that proposal they advanced to a suggestion that the pension scheme should be altogether dissociated from the Poor Law, and from that to the scheme of the Bill which he introduced in 1892. In that Bill there was a clause excluding those who had at any time been in receipt of Poor Law relief, but since then there had been a great change of opinion. A feeling had grown up that Poor Law relief should under certain conditions not be a barrier to the receipt of a pension, and that view had now reached the point that the Government was being pressed by hon. Gentlemen opposite to accept the principle that persons receiving outdoor relief should receive a pension. It was said that this clause would only mean a temporary exclusion. The provision was to apply to everyone who had received Poor Law relief after 1st January, 1908. There were many people of seventy-three years of age, and even older, whom this disqualification would affect. It might happen that they had not received relief for many years, but that this year they had been unable to overcome their difficulties and had been obliged to receive it. It would take three years before the Report of the Poor Law Commission was sifted and analysed, and these poor old people would have to wait until after the lapse of that time before there could be legislation to enable them to receive the pension granted as a right. It might be that a man at the age of sixty had begun to get Poor Law relief, and after having received it for nearly ten years, he might have gone off it this year, and would, therefore, be eligible for the pension; whereas a man might have been off Poor

Law relief all those years, and then, through accident or illness, or a severe winter, or some temporary condition connected with his employment, might have been obliged to receive it this year, and he would be excluded from the pension until another Act was passed. He wanted the Chancellor of the Exchequer to look at the matter from that point of view, and to try to introduce some principle in the exclusion on the ground of Poor Law relief. If he were to say that no one was to get a pension who had received relief for six or twelve months before the passing of the Act, that would be introducing the principle of a definite time. He would have been willing to accept that. But by the right hon. Gentleman's plans the time might run over several years. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman intended to pass another Act at the earliest possible opportunity, but not even Chancellors of the Exchequer could do what they wished. He had known Chancellors of the Exchequer who had not been able to carry out plans which they had promised two years previously. He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would consider this from the point of view of putting in some definite period as to the receipt of Poor Law relief. If it were decided that no one should get the pension who had received Poor Law relief during a period of six or twelve months before the grant of the pension, that would be a definite principle which would apply all round, next year as well as this year, until the law was altered. But he did not think that he could support the Amendment, for the simple reason that there was no money to carry it out. He had said on the Second Reading that he was astonished that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not made more use of that argument by saying that it was a question of money, which, after all, was the strongest argument that could be advanced. He did not think that this provision as to Poor Law relief could be defended argumentatively, though it could be defended and ought to be defended on the question of means. They had not the money to do it with, and that was the strongest argument to bring forward with reference to the Amendment. He hoped, however, that before the debate concluded the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to moidfy the very harsh and unjust proposal in the Bill, and fix a period instead of a date with reference to Poor Law relief.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY said he was extremely glad that his hon. friend by his Amendment, and particularly in his speech, had said that these poor people should at least have given to them an amount equal to that to be given to the pensioner who had not received Poor Law relief. If they took an extreme view of the bargain, a vast number of old people would be barred all their lives from receiving pensions, because they had received Poor Law relief. The Committee had decided that 3s. 9d. each was not enough to give married couples, but they had the fact that a great number of married couples would be left with a very much smaller allowance owing to their being excluded under the disqualification now proposed. He thought that the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman, a suggestion which now came from almost every department—they had seen it in other Bills—the Licensing Bill, the Eight-Hours Bill and other measures—was not one which could be considered as satisfactory when they were dealing with persons of over seventy years of age. A time-limit to them was a serious matter; it meant that many of them would never receive the pension; and it was a time-limit which depended not only on the will of this Ministry, but might also depend on the will of another Parliament altogether. First Commissioner of Works and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had alluded to the fact that in other schemes this matter was one for disqualification. But those schemes were founded on very different principles from those which the Government had always announced in connection with this Bill. They had announced that they were giving a pension as a right, and that every man and woman was entitled to it. When once they had taken up that position it was impossible for them to argue upon the analogy of other schemes which did not carry with them the same absolute right which had been put by the Government in the very forefront of their argument. Therefore, when the Government had done that, he thought that his hon. friend was right when he said that it was an absolute wrong if they did not carry out what was practically a promise to all these unfortunate people who were now receiving outdoor relief, and who, under the Bill, would be debarred, at all events for a considerable period, from receiving the same amount that others were receiving. They had always been told that the pension was to be kept free from the Poor Law. But he did not think that anybody in that House or out of it thought that the Poor Law claim was going to be pressed so far that anybody who by misfortune came under it was to be debarred from sharing in the boon which was going to be given by the country. They on that side of the House, at all events, thought that they must press the right hon. Gentleman to say whether he could not see his way to finding another magic egg in addition to those he had already found. A famous conjuror produced eggs from every part of a person's clothing, and the right hon. Gentleman had already shown his wonderful skill in this matter. While the sliding scale and the married couples Amendments were under consideration the Chancellor of the Exchequer showed an instance of his conjuring, and he might furnish another instance of his skill on this occasion. He was sure that the House felt this matter just as much as they felt the question of the married couples. If a free vote were taken, without pressure on the part of the Government, there was no doubt what would be the result. This was a matter which in the country would be viewed very seriously, and would interfere very materially with the prosperity and success of the Bill. On these grounds he ventured again to press upon the right hon. Gentleman whether he could not in some way meet the point. He should at all events alter the date in the Bill from 1st January, 1908, and bring it down to 1st July, or some date nearer the present time, so that the very few people who had received relief since 1st January might not be debarred from benefit, It really could not do any harm, and it would be only a small relief, though he was sure a just one.

*SIR FRANCIS CHANNING said that that was the first opportunity he had to express his opinion on these issues, and he wished to say at once that he had to repudiate any form of bargain as regarded himself. He had never entered into any bargain whatsoever, and he had an absolutely free hand to deal with these questions on their merits. In the second place, the Amendment before the Committee was a bad Amendment. If he had been called in to consult with his hon. friends about their course, he would say to them that those who agreed with him would stultify themselves if they voted for this Amendment. They none of them contemplated associating themselves with the giving of an old-age pension at the same time that outdoor relief was being received. Those who voted for the Amendment with the object of supporting the aged poor would really be voting for the pension being given to persons who were also in receipt of Poor Law relief. He had repeatedly brought before the House an Old-Age Pensions Bill to carry out a universal scheme on Mr. Booth's lines, and in doing so had introduced no disqualification from having received outdoor relief; but he had distinctly contemplated that no person was to receive the pension at the same time that he was receiving Poor Law relief. But that would be the case if this Amendment were adopted. Another point which they had to note was this. While they were deeply grateful to the Government for attempting to deal with this question at all, and so soon, while they were deeply grateful to them for having made concessions on other matters, and while they recognised that the time-limit to the disqualification of even two and a half years which they had placed in the Bill was a distinct improvement, yet he ventured to press in the very strongest way upon his right hon. friend and the Prime Minister the moral claim and absolute justice, and also the necessity of attempting to deal further with the question. What had been the whole basis of the proposal of old-age pensions?

It was, as regards the rural districts at least, that the aged poor almost inevitably in the vast proportion of cases were compelled to come upon the rates. Those who knew as well as he knew the rural districts of the Midlands knew perfectly well that the right hon. Member for South Dublin had not exaggerated, but had, if anything, understated the facts. In the case of a village he knew very well in Northamptonshire, there were most deserving persons of seventy years of age who had been kept going by the farmers until their health had finally broken down through rheumatism, ruptures, and all sorts of disabilities which had grown upon them, so that they were forced, in their last years, to accept outdoor relief. Most of these men were dear friends of his own, and he felt almost a sense of personal indignation that, after having talked to them so long about what they were going to receive from the Liberal Government, they were to be met by this disqualification. The Government ought to try to consider means of giving the pension at the earliest possible moment in these deserving cases, for these were just the people most worthy of consideration. It would be a crying shame if the Government, for the sake of a little over £1,000,000, deprived these persons of the benefits of the Bill. He appealed to the Government to deal with the question in a broad and generous spirit. In putting this matter in the form of a bargain, which he rather deprecated, before the House the other afternoon, he was convinced that the Chancellor of the Exchequer must have really felt that the claim of the people for whom he ventured to say a word now was vastly stronger than that of the well-to-do artisan with his sliding scale, or that of the married couple. This case of the aged poor was the gravest case the Government had to face, and it would be a great disaster if they did not attempt to deal with it. He felt profoundly that no Government under the sun would get his vote in the sense of repudiating the claim of these people, and at all hazards. While he could not vote for the Amendment in favour of doing justice to these people, there were three ways in which he thought the Government could deal with the question. They could do it by means of the Amendments in the names of the hon. Member for North Bedfordshire and himself, which practically evaded the administrative difficulties the Prime Minister had several times pointed out. He proposed the 1st of November, or if it was necessary it might be the 1st of December, but at any rate this would give these people a chance to get out of the miserable position which rent the hearts of the worthiest of these men and would make them still more unhappy and despairing when they thought these hopes had been held out to them, and yet they were to be denied any chance of getting old-age pensions at once and re-attaining the citizenship with which they had parted with deep sorrow and regret. This was a very important matter. He appealed to his right hon. friend, if he could not deal with the question broadly by getting rid of the disqualification altogether, to accept the Amendment to put in October or November; if he could not do that, let him accept the valuable suggestion of the hon. Member for Worcester and give a discretionary power to the local committee to deal with the more deserving of these cases as a temporary expedient till the whole question could be dealt with. He appealed in the strongest possible way to the Government not to allow the mere money argument to outweigh the logic.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) said he would like to ask a question on the construction of the section which seemed to him to raise some difficulty. According to what he understood, the debate had proceeded upon the assumption that any person who had received outdoor relief since 1st January would be for ever disqualified from receiving any pension. That would be a very hard case—much harder than the ordinary case, because during the winter months many a man might have been out of work and had two or three weeks outdoor relief. Even one week's outdoor relief would disqualify from ever getting any benefit under the Bill. If that was the construction, what was the meaning of the first part of the section? What was the necessity for enacting that while he was in receipt of any such poor relief as would disqualify from registration for Parliamentary elections he should not receive a pension? Had it any meaning at all? As far as he could see, the section would be complete on merely enacting that if any person had since 1st January, 1908, received any such relief he should be excluded, and that would cover all cases. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean to leave it open to this construction, that he must not only have received relief since 1st January, but must be still receiving it? It might be that this was only another instance of hurried drafting, but as far as he could read it the whole matter would be just as well carried out by striking out the first alternative and leaving only the second.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think we are getting a bit too wide. I cannot allow too much latitude in this matter. This seems to depend upon the words "while he is in receipt." We have got beyond those words. I think the right hon. Gentleman cannot discuss the whole of the subsection.

SIR E. CARSON said he had shown how his question was germane to the present debate, because, as he understood, the Government said they had not the money to meet all the cases which would arise under the Amendment. What he was going to suggest to the Chairman was this. He must so frame the section as not to include in the disabilities of the Bill persons who were merely for a short time taking temporary relief and had gone back to their work and were back at it without relief at the time the Bill passed. Really, the section was so drawn that it was impossible for anybody to say what it really meant.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said his right hon. friend had not had the advantage of hearing this very question dealt with on the subsection as a whole. It was then pointed out that the first half of the subsection dealt with a disqualification which on the face of the Bill stood as a permanent disqualification. But the second half of the subsection was introduced by the words "until Parliament otherwise determines," and was thereby shown to be intended as a temporary disqualification and one which would be removed as soon as the Report of the Poor Law Committee had been presented. The matter was somewhat fully dealt with last week when the Bill was last before the House, and he was just generally referring to it now.

SIR E. CARSON said he did not understand that that was any explanation at all. It really bore out what he said, that there was no difference whatsoever between the first and the second half-section, unless there were two things that must coincide before the section came into play. The first half was "until Parliament otherwise determined."

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot allow this to go on. We are discussing the whole of the subsection instead of the actual Amendment.

*MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said that anyone who had heard the speech of the hon. Member for Leicester would be very much touched by his pathos, and he greatly admired the hon. Member's vigour and general sense; but, in spite of that, it was almost with grief that he felt quite unable to support him, and would be bound to support the Government. He objected to any increase in the expenditure on these old-age pensions. It was not fair to the country, and most of all it was not fair to the pensioners themselves. On the Budget, they heard that the pensions were to cost £6,000,000. Subsequently the £6,000,000 had developed into £7,500,000, and the Amendment would add rather less than £500,000. He was afraid the Bill would not leave the House before they had compromised themselves annually to the extent of £9,000,000 or £10,000,000. They had decided on a non-contributory scheme the other night after a brief discussion. If they had decided on a contributory scheme—if they had decided that the beneficiaries should contribute, say, one glass or two glasses of beer a week—they could have made the scheme as secure and as permanent as the National Debt. He believed that this non-contributory scheme, including this Amendment if it passed, would vanish into thin air at the first signal defeat that England endured at sea. These non-contributory pensions would revert to the nation whenever the nation was fighting for its life. Speaking now in regard to this or any other Amendment—[laughter]—hon. Gentlemen were eminently discourteous. But if he were in a minority of one in the whole House he would say what he thought, and it was a rather exceptional thing when a politician in the House did actually say what he thought. If they increased the amount of the pension they would decrease their security. He did not believe under the present non-contributory scheme these pensions were worth ten years purchase, and if they added this amount of £2,500,000 or £3,000,000 he did not believe they would be worth five years purchase. The dice were loaded against them. They were gambling in the country's security, and he did not look forward with hope or happiness to the permanence of the present scheme.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. MASTERMAN, West Ham, N.) said that, speaking as he did in the regrettable absence of his right hon. friend who represented the Department responsible for Poor Law administration, he hoped he might be allowed, to use the words of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, to say what he thought of this matter. He had listened to every word and he was still a little uncertain whether hon. Gentlemen had been prepared to say what they thought. It appeared to some hon. Members perfectly legitimate that the most monstrous charges should be advanced as to the motive which prompted any particular restrictions, and they had been openly told that it was only because paupers had not votes and could not be represented in the ballot boxes that these restrictions had been placed in the Bill. [OPPOSITION cries of "No."] Yes, the hon. Member for Worcester said it.

*MR. GOULDING: What I said was in reference to the claim of the hon. Member for Barnstaple.

MR. SOARES: I never said it.

*MR. MASTERMAN said he was glad to accept that disclaimer, because if every hon. Member said what he thought upon this point they would acknowledge that no Member of the House wished to see hard cases dealt harshly with. Such cases must arise within the personal knowledge of all hon. Members. What were they to think of those who at one moment earnestly advocated a contributory scheme which *ex-hypothesi* must rule out every pauper, and at another time with pathetic fervour passionately pleaded for the pauper in connection with this matter? The hon. Member for Worcester had said that if the Bill passed in its present form it would be a black stain upon the legislation of the country. He would remind the hon. Member of the Aged Pensions Bill of 1903, in regard to which it was declared that only those should be qualified who had not within the last twenty years received Poor Law relief, other than medical relief, in relation to circumstances wholly exceptional in character. The hon. Member for Worcester might declare that every case he had mentioned would come under those circumstances which were entirely exceptional in character, but which according to the right hon. Member for South Dublin were the normal condition they were now dealing with. Therefore, the wholly exceptional character of the pension in the hard case absolutely vanished. Nor need he draw the attention of the House too closely to the fact that the scheme of the hon. Member for Worcester provided for some 450,000 pensions of which half would be paid by the local authority, whereas the Government provided for 572,000 pensions quite apart from anything which the local authorities themselves might do. The right hon. Member for South Dublin had made a speech which very much surprised him, coming from one who had occupied the position of the head of the Board to which he at the present moment had the honour to be Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman had drawn a moving picture of two people, one out of work supported by the landlord and the other an out-of-work who had to go upon the rates. That was a picture of the present day, and it was not a particular disqualification put in with regard to pensions. Every hard case of that kind came under the disqualifications at the present time. Therefore the right hon. Gentleman's argument was not against this pension scheme, but against the whole system of outdoor relief carrying with it penalising clauses. It was assumed, and it was rightly assumed and officially acknowledged by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the whole matter was one connected with finance and if it was financially possible he would deal immediately with the whole question. If it was practicable by the continuance of the sugar tax which the Leader of the Opposition had laid before his followers as a practical policy to provide old-age pensions in these cases, the proposal would still present great difficulties. Speaking as one who had some responsibility for Poor Law administration, he held that it would be impossible to accept the Amendment before the House or even to accept it in an enlarged form. The Amendment merely made a distinction between indoor and outdoor pauperism, and sought to raise the embargo from outdoor pauperism. It should not be overlooked that various methods of relief were adopted by different boards of guardians which were often adjacent. Immediately they attempted to carry out this proposal a larger case would naturally arise from the consideration of the condition of those who had been squeezed into the workhouse by some particular kind of policy which refused all outdoor relief, as distinguished from those boards who were lax in outdoor relief. The hon. Member had suggested that they should assist the new pension system by subsidising the Poor Law or allowing the pension authorities to subsidise the Poor Law.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN said that what he stated was that the cost to the public would only be 2s. a head more whether it came from the rates or from the taxes. His point was that only 2s. was to be found out of public money.

*Mr. MASTERMAN replied that "public money" was a very elastic definition. If they assumed that all the 5s. was to come from the National Exchequer, then the scheme attained the region of dreams, because they would immediately want £2,700,000 more, and although the Opposition were prepared to allocate the sugar duty for this purpose, he did not believe that was a financial proposition which would be agreeable to the House as a whole. If they were going to allow part to be paid by the Exchequer and part by the guardians in the proportion of 3s. to 2s. that would be a system utterly vicious in character, going behind the 1834 scheme, and a system which every man familiar with Poor Law administration would undoubtedly condemn. If, on the other hand, they were going to draw from the local authorities the amount which they now gave in outdoor relief and hand it over as a 5/- pension, then it would be impossible to raise that question without raising much larger questions of local finance and their relation to Imperial finance. Those questions were awaiting solution by some modification of the Poor Law, which pressed severely on certain districts and very lightly on others. If they transferred this as an Imperial charge, then it would be impossible to make that arrangement under an old-age pension scheme. It had been said again and again in the debate that of necessity such a proposal must mean indefinite postponement. They had had a deliberate assertion made in the country and in the House that immediately after the Report of the Poor Law Commission or as speedily as legislation could be devised, not only the aged poor, but the whole question of the Poor Law would come under revision, and the promise had been made absolutely independently of the introduction of paupers under this scheme. The argument had been used that from the moment this scheme commenced to operate there would be a continual tendency towards the transference of financial obligations from the local authorities to the Imperial Exchequer, and that acting automatically it would increase every year, making it impossible for Parliament to deal with the matter as a whole. But they had the concession made by his right hon. friend, which had been welcomed by hon. Members on the Ministerial side, that instead of leaving it in the vague form provided by the words "until Parliament determines," he would specifically provide that it should operate down to the end of the year 1910. Realising something of the intricacies not only of the Poor Law administration, but of what any large change in the Poor Law might mean in a Bill which must be large and intricate in its character, he should say that even if that obligation were not laid down, no Party in the House would be able to carry out the scheme in very much less time than that. It meant legislation at the early part of the session of the year after next if it was to be in operation by December 1910. That provision, he thought, ought to have commanded some other recognition than the continual criticism to which it had been subjected, because it was proposing to do what no Committee had ever recommended before, and was far more liberal, making every possible kind of restriction, so that no one except those who were really paupers in the true and natural sense of the term should come under these disqualifications. He thought such a measure deserved more favourable consideration than statements concerning the black stain of the Bill or assertions like that of the hon. Member for Leicester, that the Bill was a cruel arrangement calculated to produce more misery and less enjoyment. He could give cases by the dozen of those who came to accept Poor Law relief in their old age. In this measure they provided for cases which would otherwise not be provided for, and which had not been provided for from the beginning of time until this Bill came into operation. This class of the community had as much right to serious treatment as the pauper and he admitted that that class of case had up to this moment been absolutely neglected. No doubt there were hard cases involving considerable suffering and a sense of injustice which would arise during the next two years in regard to those who were at present in receipt of outdoor relief, but he was not unhopeful that their case might be alleviated in two directions. There was first the possibility that as the amount of obligation upon the guardians decreased, an increasing number, not of those who had had relief, but who would have had relief—those whom his right hon. friend described as persons who were ripening for relief—would be taken off the guardians, who would be more prepared to carry out the spirit of the Order of August, 1900, in the way of making more adequate the relief given to those who at present were receiving inadequate relief, and therefore not the Exchequer, but the guardians themselves would have less liability to face in the future in providing for those people. An enormous amount of money at the present time went to the support of men and women just in order to keep them off the rates. There were charities, organised and unorganised, from which poor people received small subsidies, sometimes less than five shillings a week, in order that they should not become paupers. The State took over these obligations, and he thought they might not be without hope that the charitable public would not be less generous, and that part of the money which had been subscribed would go to make more satisfactory the lot of the pauper population if the pauper population would come under the control of the charities whose funds were now to be liberated. It was easy to get up and make passionate appeals to the House, to read out details of cases, to say that what was proposed was in accordance with the opinion neither of the Liberal nor of the Conservative Party, and to claim that all these people should be immediately relieved. The Government were bound entirely in this matter by the limitations imposed upon them. He spoke not for the Treasury, but for the administrative department of the Poor Law. It was evident that the suggestion as to the beggarly £800,000 made by the hon. Member for Shropshire had already vanished, and the demand was for nearly £3,000,000. In the circumstances he thought they should be content with what they were getting without making extravagant demands.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) said the hon. Member had referred to the fact that the Report of the Poor Law Commission was expected before very long, and that they should wait. He did not see what that Report had to do with the question they were discussing. They were calling attention to the cases of cruelty, hardship, and injustice which would arise under the proposal in the Bill, and he took it that his hon. friend would not say that they should be influenced in regard to that matter by any Report. The argument had been continually brought forward that the proposal of the Government would induce poor people to avoid coming on the rates so as to qualify for becoming pensioners. What did that mean? It meant that people must continue in a state of suffering for an indefinite time. But starvation, privation, and destitution could not wait. There was not only the case of the man himself to be considered, but there was the wife and children. He thought, therefore, that argument fell to the ground. At the time Lord Aberdare's Commission sat it was shown in evidence that three out of every seven persons of the age of sixty-five were paupers. If under this Bill the age-limit was fixed at seventy, a still larger number of persons would be disqualified unless the Amendment, or something like it, was adopted. His hon. friend had said that the local committee should discriminate as to character. He was somewhat tired of hearing of the deserving and the non-deserving, the thrifty and the non-thrifty. If those who talked in that way would realise what was meant by having an income of 10s. or 12s. a week, and meeting all the charges incidental to family life, they would cease to talk of the want of thrift with regard to these poor people. The local committee was to decide who was deserving. That was a task which no human being could undertake. There were thousands of men, especially in the rural districts, who had carried on the battle of life for forty or fifty years and had then, through ill-health or some of the other incidents of the fight, broken down in spirits. They "threw up the sponge" and fell into the ranks of what were called the undeserving. If the history of all paupers could be written, it would be found that those who appeared to be undeserving now had in their lives displayed the greatest heroism. He himself would omit all the disqualifications from the Bill. If the Labour Members were true to their order, they would insist that there should be no disqualifications in the Bill which would prevent a man who was in need from receiving an old-age pension. He instanced the case of a poor woman seventy-two years of age—and this case was typical of tens of thousands—who was a model of industry and trustworthiness. Through an accident she was incapacitated for all work, and since then she had received 3s. a week from the Poor Law guardians. That sum was supplemented by friends who knew her. She would be treated as an undeserving person and ruled out with regard to an old-age pension. It had been suggested that those who had subscribed to friendly societies for so many years should have that fact accepted as proof of thrift and care. In this debate hon. Members had shown that they were thinking a little too much of the population in the great towns where the conditions were altogether different from those in the rural districts. His own experience was that the labourers in the rural districts were divided into two classes. Those of the first class would almost starve themselves and their children in order that they might save a few pounds and pay 6d. a week to a friendly society. That did not affect the proposition of his hon. friend.

THE CHAIRMAN said he was sorry to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but this was not a question of outdoor relief.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS said he was replying to what his hon. friend behind him had said. The question of money was important, but he asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to meet the case at once. It lay with the right hon. Gentleman to say whether or not this great act of injustice and cruelty should be inflicted on such a large number of persons. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had said that a contributory system would rule out all paupers. That was not quite true. He was not in favour of a contributory system because of its impossibility, but the old paupers could be provided for by special means. He was sorry to hear his hon. friend throw those poor people on casual charity, which might or might not be forthcoming. That was not a satisfactory answer. The fact was that there was no middle course; the Government must either accept this Amendment or refuse it. To give a promise of further legislation in two years time would not meet the case. He sympathised with the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his difficulty with regard to money, but they had such faith in his resources that he had no doubt he would be able to overcome that difficulty. At any rate it was worth trying; and if he would make this alteration he would improve the Bill, and make it understood by the great mass of the poor people.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that the debate had been intensely interesting to all those who had taken an active part in the administration of relief under the Poor Law; but curiously enough the most important argument against the Amendment had only been used by one of the last speakers, viz.: the extraordinary inequality of the financial operation. That could not be denied for a moment. In some parts of England, and in Ireland there was one kind of discrimination between indoor and outdoor relief; whereas elsewhere an absolutely different principle prevailed. The very cruelty of this discrimination was a ground for refusing to support any of the limited proposals that had been brought before the House. Many hon. Members had been asked over and over again to put their names on the back of a Bill, but had refused on account of the discrimination, and they said that they could only support a universal scheme. The House hardly realised the extreme cruelty that would now be involved for the first time. Hon. Members talked about the stigma connected with Poor Law relief. In some parishes there might be a stigma, but taking the rural districts generally there was no stigma. The people did not know who received poor relief. When the revising barrister was considering the Parliamentary electors list names were handed in surreptitiously, and names struck off in a whispered fashion. A case had been mentioned of a man whose wife had received the price of a coffin for his child from the board of guardians. Now, for the first time, a stigma would be imposed. One would be taken and the other left. Everybody would know; the man would be pointed at because his wife had accepted the price of a coffin, and that that was why he was struck off the list. There were now cases where certain relief would be given expressly for the purpose of causing disqualification. The man would in future be placed in the position of a criminal. There was a balance of argument between the financial difficulties in the way and accepting this crude distinction involving real cruelty in discrimination.

*MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.) said that the Secretary to the Local Government Board appeared to be somewhat angry with certain hon. Members who supported the Amendment, and said that the Government had been charged with deliberate cruelty. Of course, that was not so. For himself he wanted to say that the distinction between paupers and other poor people was entirely unreal. In many country districts there were numerous people who received outdoor relief from time to time, but who for the greater part of their lives were ratepayers. They struggled on year after year, but when a bad season came, or a death in the family occurred, they were forced to ask for temporary relief. He was entirely against any disqualification of paupers of that kind; and he was afraid that as the Government had not held out any modification of their scheme in this respect, he and those who agreed with him would be forced to support the Amendment. The Government had not given sufficient weight to the arguments of hon. Members who had pointed out the extreme unfairness of attaching this disqualification at all. But if it was to be maintained, notice of the disqualification ought to be given; and he was extremely disappointed that the Government had not seen their way to accept one of the Amendments extending either to the end of the year or to a later period the point of time at which the disqualification would begin to operate. He hoped the Government would even yet see their way to accept that before the closure came into play. If, however, the Government were not able to yield on one or other of these points he trusted that, at least, they would accept the suggestion of the right hon. Member for South Dublin. The right hon. Gentleman made an appeal to the Government that if they would not abandon the disqualification of pauperism as such, and if they were unwilling to change the date in the Bill, that they should in some way make it clear that the only people to be disqualified would be those who were more or less permanent paupers. There had not been a single word said in the debate that would justify the indefinite postponement of the benefits of the Bill to those persons who for a few weeks or days in times of great stress had since the 1st January received some outdoor relief.

SIR F. BANBURY said that as he proposed to vote with the Government on this Amendment he would give shortly his reasons for so doing. It was not because he was in favour of the Government or thought the Bill was a good one, but because he foresaw that if the Committee continued to make alterations to meet hard cases they would soon be pledged to an expenditure of something like £15,000,000. First they lost £100,000 on the sliding scale and then £350,000 on aged married couples, and now they were asked to lose a further £2,500,000 on outdoor paupers. The case of indoor relief was just as hard. In one district in London which he knew, no outdoor relief was given, and people struggled along without until they were driven to go indoors. The Amendment was only another nail in the coffin of the Bill, because if they went on as they had been going every time there was a hard case, they would say "This is a hard case and we must find money from some unknown quarter and meet it." Under those circumstances he should support the Government. Later on he would move to leave out the words 1910. He was not in favour of putting off the evil day but of grasping the nettle at once. The real fact was they could not afford the money, and therefore, they had better drop all this clap-trap of humanitarism. He would not support the Amendment because they could not afford the money, and if hon. Gentlemen below the gangway wished to include all these cases they should either have insisted on a contributory scheme or have come forward and said they would not accept any scheme which had any qualification in it at all.

Mr. PRICE said there was no part of the Bill that so much appealed to the country generally and the agricultural districts in particular as this clause. On the face of it the Bill was to relieve the poorest of the poor, and the poorest of the poor outside the poorhouse were those in receipt of outdoor relief. The Committee must not forget also that those in receipt of that relief had had the greatest struggle to live before they accepted it. Let Members contrast two cases with which he was familiar. One was the case of a dressmaker, who had for many years struggled to keep herself out of the poor house, but who at last had to apply for outdoor relief and now was in receipt of 2s. 6d. a week. The other was the case of a man who had built himself a house in which he lived rent free and apart from which he had an income of 6/- a week. That man would get a pension; the poor seamstress would not. Such a thing as that was going to create grave discontent throughout the country, and therefore he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would still be able to do something in this matter. With regard to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Shropshire, to make up the amount received from the local authorities in the way of outdoor relief to 5/-, he thought it would be a great mistake to supplement the amount these people got. The better way would be for the whole amount to be given by the Exchequer and the amount now given by the locality deducted as it easily might from the grant in relief of local rates. He also thought that to put the date 1910 into the Bill would cause grave disappointment to a great many people, because it must be remembered that the people affected were seventy and over and many would not live the extra two years. It was because such hardships would be felt that he trusted the Chancellor of the Exchequer would even now find some way out of the difficulty. He was quite certain that the expenditure could be met. He believed the Estimates on which the Budget was based were too conservative. That had always been the case in the past and far larger surpluses had been realised than was estimated and he believed this year it would be the same.

*Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich) thought the Government must now realise that their attitude on this question was absolutely indefensible. They had hardly found one champion for the maintenance of this disability from any quarter of the House. If he had been in doubt before as to how he should record his vote the mere fact that the Government had converted the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London would have certainly decided the question. The chief point made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that the Poor Law Commission was sitting and that before dealing with this matter it was necessary to wait for their Report, because out of the Report would be found the necessity for readjusting the financial relations between the State and the localities. If there was an insuperable difficulty in the way of dealing with this case it must have been also an insuperable difficulty in dealing with the question when the Chancellor offered this as an alternative to the concession made to aged couples, but it was not. He quite agreed with the right hon. Member for the Bordesley Division that the Labour Party must be a powerful factor in this case. If they were as powerful as the hon. Gentleman believed them to be they would remove at once this disability. He was, however, afraid that on this occasion their power had been overrated. They could neither compel nor

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brodie, H. C.
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly, "That the word 'indoor' be there inserted in the proposed Amendment."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 142; Noes, 257. (Division List No. 142.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Brodie, H. C.
Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.

Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Wor.)
Cleland, J. W.
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dillon, John
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haddock, George B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael

Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jowett, F. W.
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kerry, Earl of
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Lamb,Edmund G.(Leominster)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)

Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorge D.
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Bridgeman and Mr. Lane-Fox.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine

Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene

Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W. H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duckworth, James
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)

Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C.(Kincard)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, RobertJohn (Norfolk,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

Question, "That the word 'poor' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

*MR. GOULDING moved to insert after "poor relief" the words "owing to improvidence." He said his object was to give the committee some discretion so that they could consider the specially hard cases which had been alluded to by several speakers. He more particularly desired that some relief should be given to those individuals who had exercised thrift and joined in their earlier years, friendly societies which had since failed, and who, owing to their age, had been disqualified from joining another. These really were a most deserving class. At the time they joined these friendly societies the Foresters, the Oddfellows, and the other big societies had not gone into the villages at all, and agricultural labourers had no means of getting into the towns where there might have been friendly societies existing. He had three specific cases which deserved attention. There was the case of Albert Smith, who was seventy-six years of age, had for fifty years belonged to a friendly society which only became defunct six months ago, had since naturally ceased to belong to any friendly society, and had had to receive poor law relief and so become totally disqualified under the Bill. There was the case of another man, James Giles, who was ninety-two years of age, and had remained a member of a friendly society as long as it existed, which was until three or four years ago. He was never ill till he was over seventy-six years of age, and then could not get any sick pay; he worked until eighty-six years of age and had since received outdoor relief. He had brought up seventeen children, providing the necessary ammunition for the service of the country, and he had in every way open to him qualified himself for a well-deserved pension in old age. Then he had another case, George Sainsbury, sixty-nine years of age. He also for fifty-five years belonged to a friendly society, which within the last twelve months had broken up; he had consequently had to take poor law relief, and was disqualified for receiving any benefit. What he desired was that some discretion should be left in the hands of the committee who were distributing the pensions, that they might inquire into these cases, so that where people had exercised thrift in the only possible way open to them, relief might be given to them and they should not be deprived of that pension which was going to be given to others simply because 1st January was inserted in the Bill. The Secretary to the Local Government Board had alluded to the disqualifications in the Aged Pensioners Bill. In every one of the Bills brought forward extraordinary circumstances were to be dealt with specifically in each case. He could not imagine any circumstances which would come in that category more than that of those of the character quoted—men who as long as it was possible continuously subscribed to a friendly society. Every one of these cases could have been dealt with under that Bill. He appealed most earnestly to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, even if he could not accept the Amendment, that he would give an undertaking that he would in his own Resolution on the Paper introduce some words giving the committee some discretion to deal with these cases and not absolutely to exclude them from any possible participation All these people had exercised thrift in joining the only societies open to them when they were young men. When the societies broke they were too old to get admission into substantial societies like the Oddfellows or Foresters. It was only to save time that he did not quote several other cases of hardship that were known to him. Without some amendment the Bill would inflict much wrong in many villages. Take the case in Norfolk, where there were thirteen old people over seventy years of age in a village where the population was only 350, and only one of those was in any way a possible candidate for an old-age pension, and his prospects were doubtful. At least ten had received outdoor relief, so were disqualified, and two had means. Surely it could not be argued that such cases as those ought not to be dealt with under this Bill. He hoped that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not accept his Amendment he would at least insert some words which would meet his point, otherwise he would have to press his Amendment to a division.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, after the word 'relief,' to insert the words 'owing to improvidence.'"—(*Mr. Goulding.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LLOYD GEORGE regretted that an Amendment of so much importance was not on the Paper. It raised the very issue which the Poor Law Commission was appointed to report upon—as to how they were to differentiate between the deserving and the undeserving poor. It was generally accepted by both parties that legislation must be brought in to deal with the question at an early date. He had already given an undertaking that the very point which the hon. Member had raised should be attended to probably next year. But he could not now at once set up the proper machinery for winnowing the chaff from the wheat, and any sweeping and far-reaching Amendment of this kind was beyond the conception of the Bill as drawn. They must wait until they had the recommendations of the Poor Law Commission. He could not at once improvise the machinery necessary to carry into operation an Amendment of this kind, and he could not promise to introduce any form of words which would deal with such a vast problem. They would probably find some 150,000 cases of poor old people who had kept off the Poor Law as long as they possibly could. These were people who must eventually come into the pension scheme, but before they did there must be machinery for separating the deserving and undeserving, and for readjusting the relations of local and Imperial finance. The hon. Member for Ashford had suggested that the contributions should be in the proportion of three parts local to two parts from Imperial sources. The Imperial Exchequer could not accept the whole of this burden, while at the same time relieving local taxation to the extent of £3,500,000. He was really sorry, but he could not see his way to meet the hon. Member for Worcester.

Mr. WALTER LONG said he was afraid the Chancellor of the Exchequer, owing to want of proper notice, did not fully apprehend what his hon. friend desired by his Amendment. The words suggested would open up a wide field of inquiry and might be held to meet all those cases of the deserving poor. There would be a large number of cases in the rural districts where people had made every effort to maintain themselves. His hon. friend had given a case where for fifty years a man had subscribed to the village club and then when he was seventy the club broke, and the man had to go upon the Poor Law. The breaking of village clubs not only made it difficult for the victims, but it made it almost impossible for a time to get men to join friendly societies. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was throwing a very difficult and invidious duty upon the pension committees. He thought it would be very difficult under the Bill to find men suited to the work which they would be called upon to discharge on those committees. If they had to deal with cases of the kind mentioned, he doubted whether it would be possible to find a competent committee in any village in the country. Many years ago he made an exhaustive inquiry into the case of village clubs, their then position, the number that had come to grief and those which were likely to come to grief, and he put a scheme before the late Mr. Goschen, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer. Since then many of those village clubs had disappeared and left their members stranded. That had for a time a discouraging effect upon men joining friendly societies. Those men who were stranded in the villages had not only suffered severely, but they had been the cause of a good many of their neighbours not showing the foresight displayed by those who joined friendly societies. The numbers were not great, and they were decreasing year by year. It would be extremely difficult to enforce this invidious distinction against those who had not only done nothing wrong, but had done everything in their power to provide against the day of distress.

Lord R. CECIL expressed the hope that the Government would accept the Amendment, not perhaps in the particular form in which it had been moved, for he thought the words were too wide, but in a form which would meet the obvious objections to their proposal. The Chancellor of the Exchequer himself admitted that something should be done, because he recognised that a man who accepted outdoor relief through misfortune, and not improvidence, should be treated differently from a man who was an ordinary pauper. Nor was the Amendment intended to complete the distinction between the deserving and the undeserving. He understood that his hon. friend who moved the Amendment intended it to meet the special case of those who had genuinely made provision for their old age, and who, owing to the failure of a building society, or the fact that they had not been able to keep up their contributions to the end, or something of that kind, were not now in a position to save themselves by their own efforts and were bound to accept Poor Law relief, it might be very trifling relief, and were cut out of the benefits of the Bill in consequence. He did not understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say that he would not be prepared to deal with that particular case. It was one which would not involve great expense. He admitted that logic had not much to do with the Bill, but he could not see on what logical ground the Government could defend the position that the habitual loafer was not to be penalised if he had been a member of a friendly society, while a pauper, who had not been a member of a friendly society, but who had made every possible provision for old age, was to be penalised.

Mr. LLOYD GEORGE: Do I understand the noble Lord to say that the habitual loafer is to be qualified if he has been a member of a friendly society?

Lord R. CECIL: So I read the Amendment.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, we simply take membership of a friendly society for ten years as an indication that a man cannot be a loafer. Men cannot go on paying contributions year after year and at the same time be loafers.

Lord R. CECIL said the loafer who was also a member of a friendly society was rather a rare person. As a matter of fact, the wording of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment was that, provided a person had subscribed to a friendly society, or made other provision for his old age, the earlier part of the disqualification was not to apply. That was the way it was put in the Amendment, although the Chancellor of the Exchequer might not have meant it. He suggested to the right hon. Gentleman that some provision might be put in to meet the point which had been raised. He could not conceive any answer to the proposal of his hon. friend the Member for Worcester. Why not save people who had made provision for their old age from the pauper disqualification in precisely the same manner as it was proposed to save idlers? Everyone who had listened to the debates must feel there were only two alternatives—to have either a contributory scheme or a universal scheme. He did not believe there was a single Member who, sitting in his room by himself, would venture to say a word for the scheme as it stood. He was not at all sure that even the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself would. Were it not for the restrictions imposed upon debate the truth of the contention that the scheme must be either contributory or universal would have so forced itself into the minds of hon. Members opposite that they could not possibly go on supporting the Bill. Nothing but the guillotine could save the measure from the fate it so richly merited.

Mr. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes) said he had naturally a great deal of sympathy with the suggestion of the hon. Member for Worcester to introduce words in the clause which would leave the door open to enable the Chancellor of the Exchequer to deal with the matter at a later date. It was rather difficult to say whether any suggestion was or was not logical. If they made an exception in one case, it was extremely difficult not to make it in another. If they were going to introduce words which would enable men who had contributed to friendly societies to have an advantage under the Bill, that would be unfair to women. Women were not members of friendly societies. There was another objection which he asked the right hon. Gentleman to keep before him. He hoped nothing would be done to put on the local committees the duty of picking and choosing between one applicant and another. They ought to try to maintain the automatic character of the old-age pension scheme. Those who had been members of boards of guardians knew how terribly difficult it was to judge between one case and another. If they could not have a universal scheme, let them, at any rate, start this one in such a way that those who were to receive the benefit should get it as a matter of right and not as a favour from the local pension committee.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) said there was some reason for supporting the Amendment in the fact that it was obviously a defence of friendly societies. The Amendment was practically an acknowledgment of the valuable work done by friendly societies. It appeared to him that the Labour Members did not always sufficiently consider existing conditions. Hon. Members on that side of the House believed that the whole Bill was being rushed through after being carelessly and improperly drafted. The result was that the Bill contained a huge number of anomalies. It would have been wiser to have waited until the Poor Law Commission had reported, when they would have had the benefit of the opinions exprepressed by men of experience in these matters. He did not blame the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, but he blamed his predecessor, who prepared the measure for which the right hon. Gentleman was now responsible.

Sir J. BETHELL (Essex, Romford) said there were a number of men who were receiving outdoor relief and the amount of such relief was being repaid to the board of guardians by the relatives of the men. Would these cases be eligible for a pension as they were not a burden on the rates ?

Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) said it was quite unnecessary for the hon. Member for Govan to endeavour to teach the Labour Members their duty in relation to friendly societies. The whole of the hon. Member's speech was wide of the Amendment before the Committee. The Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Worcester did not deal with the whole question of friendly societies. It dealt only with those persons who had been compelled to receive outdoor relief because the societies of which they had formerly been members had broken. There was an Amendment to be moved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer later on dealing with those who were actually members of friendly societies, and the Labour Members would give it their most hearty support at the proper time, because it would protect the members not only of friendly societies, but of all other kindred societies. He objected to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Worcester on two grounds, and he hoped it would not be pressed. He objected to it, in the first place, because it would cast on the local pension committees an intolerable duty. Under the Bill as it stood the work of the pension committees was going to be very difficult. If they accepted the Amendment they would make the work of the pension committees almost intolerable. He objected because it was going to involve a process of inquiry of the most objectionable character. The hon. Member said it was not to be an inquisitorial inquiry, but it was to be inquisitorial *plus* association with the guardians, and anything of that kind was most objectionable to the Labour Members. They were sorry that the previous Amendment had not been carried. They wanted—and this ought to have been previously stated in reply to the challenge that was thrown out to them—to sweep away from the Bill every disqualification which had in it anything in the nature of a discrimination. But having been defeated in securing that object, they were not going to support an Amendment which involved an inquiry and especially an inquiry in association with the guardians. However worthy the object of the hon. Member for Worcester was, that hon. Gentleman's Amendment ought to be opposed, and he sincerely hoped that he would not press it to a division.

Mr. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) thought there was a simple way out of the difficulty. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had on the Paper a proviso that in the event of a man being disqualified from want of industry he should be exempt if, for ten years, he had belonged to a friendly society. That would be automatic and not inquisitorial in character. Why not extend that proviso by inserting "provided that a person not actually in receipt of poor relief shall not be disqualified under the foregoing paragraphs of this section."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the hon. Member's suggestion dealt with a totally different question from what they were discussing at the present moment. He was bound to point out to the Committee that all these Amendments on a money Bill had a way of working out differently from what was intended. The hon. Member for Worcester had talked about friendly societies which had become insolvent, and said that that accounted for a considerable number of paupers in the country. But if that were so, the case was formidable and yet the hon. Member had not given the slightest idea of how many paupers there were, or any indication of the expenditure which the Amendment would involve. This was a money Bill, and before anyone moved an Amendment he should go through the same process as the Government had gone through, of calculating what each proposal really meant. The hon. Member had not even in the most shadowy fashion hinted at the amount of expenditure his Amendment would involve. Would the number of paupers he referred to be 250,000, or 100,000, or 50,000? Even if only 50,000, that would mean £650,000 added to the annual charge on the Exchequer. He did not think hon. Members ought really to press Amendments on the Government unless they knew how they would work out. He did not complain of hon. Members sitting below the gangway, and for this reason: they did not make any proposal, however sweeping, which they were not prepared to back up with legislation next year. But hon. Members opposite were not in that position, and they had no right to press any grave financial commitments upon the Government unless they went a step further and said they had some information on which calculations could be based, and that they were prepared to support the Government next year in finding the money.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said that the right hon. Gentleman had criticised the Opposition for making proposals which involved the expenditure of money without counting the cost. He pleaded guilty to that frankly, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman was to some extent open to the same criticism. It was not the fault of the Opposition that they had not at their elbow an army of highly-skilled statisticians capable of making actuarial calculations, and the right hon. Gentleman should not complain if they put forward an Amendment which he himself admitted was founded on justice. The Amendment was not one which turned on a question of finance which might be solved next year or the year after, but was a question of abstract justice. The hon. Member for Barnard Castle had said that the Amendment was going to place an immense responsibility on the pensions committees, but the responsibility already placed on these committees in country villages was such that it would be difficult to get the best men to join them, because they would be the local representatives of what appeared on the face of it to be an act of cruel injustice. The hon. Member had said that the Amendment would involve objectionable inquiries and in the same breath that he and his colleagues were going to support an Amendment which would throw upon the pensions committees the duty of going back on a man's life till he was twenty-one years of age, in order to determine whether that man had worked as well as he could, or as he had had opportunity, or whether he had worked according to his needs, or for the benefit or maintenance of his family. Really, when the hon. Member for Barnard Castle was going to support such an Amendment as that, he need not be afraid of supporting the Amendment of the hon. Member for Worcester that a man should not be disqualified if he had been a member of a friendly society that had broken. The Chancellor of the Exchequer thought that they could not improvise machinery, but he had only to graft it on the existing pensions committee, which would be a pure detail, and it would be unnecessary to improvise fresh machinery for that purpose. The hon. Member for Wiltshire hoped that nothing would be done, as indicated by the Amendment, to make the pensions committee pick and choose. That could not be avoided, do what they would, so long as the system was not universal or contributory. For his own part, he did not see why the committees should not be allowed to pick and choose, because if they had some latitude they could help cases of really admitted hardship. He confessed that the word "improvidence" was a vague and not very suitable word, but "providence" was an equally vague word. If a man subscribed 3d. a month to a Post Office Savings Bank to the age of between sixty and seventy years, he was to be qualified for the receipt of a pension of 5s. a week for life. That was what the Government called "providence." It might be only 2d. a month, nothing was laid down. It was all to be done by rules. There was, it was true, a certain vagueness in the term "improvidence," but though this Amendment contained nebulous terms which were difficult to define there was no doubt as to the principle which his hon. friend desired to put before the House.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing) said that as one of those who went boldly into the lobby and voted for a contributory scheme he was compelled to take part in the discussion on this Amendment for the purpose of emphasising the position created by the line which the Government had taken. Right hon. Gentlemen opposite, having taken it upon themselves to introduce a measure of this kind, must take upon themselves the full burden and responsibility of making the scheme thorough and complete in every sense. The right hon. Gentleman had blamed the Opposition for not coming forward with all their figures arranged as to what would be the probable cost to the Exchequer of whittling down these objections to the scheme. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had not been altogether candid, because he had an Amendment himself lower down on the Paper—an Amendment which would make a considerable alteration in the disqualifications which it was proposed to put into the Bill—but the right hon. Gentleman had not told the Committee what figures he had gone into. He could not say he had not ascertained what would be the cost of removing these disqualifications from the men who had contributed for ten years to a friendly society. It would have been just as easy for the right hon. Gentleman to have computed what the acceptance of this Amendment would have involved. Therefore, it was hardly a good answer to say that this Amendment could not be entertained because the Government had no means of ascertaining the cost. He thought the Government would be wise in these matters where hardships were shown to exist to allow the financial considerations to take a second place. [Cries of "No" from the MINISTERIAL Benches.] He did not wonder that there were certain misgivings among hon. Members opposite at the morass into which the Government were leading them. These petty exclusions would create grave prejudice against the Government in the country. There could be no possible reason why a person who had subscribed to a friendly society should not be allowed to go free from these disabilities, for the past contribution to a friendly society for such a period was of itself evidence of a thrifty mind. He was certainly surprised that the hon. Member for Barnard Castle should have objected to this Amendment on the ground that it would result in inquisitorial proceedings. Surely it was indeed straining at the gnat to object to the suggestion contained in the Amendment when the House and the hon. Member considered the drastic inquiry which the provisions of the Bill prescribed, an inquiry which extended practically over the whole period of the life of the applicant for a pension. Although there might be some objection to the operation of the Amendment in urban districts, on the ground of the difficulty of verification there could be none in the rural districts, where no man certainly would object if he had been out of work for some time to submitting himself to examination as to the reasons why he had been out of work, especially as that would most probably be a matter of common knowledge in a village community. He respectfully advised the Government to reconsider the position.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said the debate on the Amendment illustrated very sharply the difficulty in which the Committee found themselves through the Government having introduced a scheme of great social reform, founded solely upon finance, without sufficient consideration. The House, having considered the Bill, drafted Amendments and made suggestions, giving the Government ample time to consider those suggestions.

*The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Caldwell, Lanarkshire, Mid.) said this Amendment was not on the Paper.

Mr. BOWLES contended that the principle of the Amendment was embodied in another which had been set down in the name of the hon. Member for Worcester.

*The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member must confine his remarks to the Amendment before the Committee.

Mr. BOWLES said that the Amendment being similar to that in the name of the hon. Member for Worcester the Government must have been perfectly well aware for some days past that this point would be raised. It was not sufficient for the Government to say that although the Amendment was reasonable and they had nothing to say against the wisdom of the proposal, they must object to it on the ground that they had made no inquiry as to the cost.

*The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN warned the hon. Member that he was now entering into what had just been ruled to be out of order.

Mr. BOWLES said he was against and should resist any serious or great extension of this system of old-age pensions, and therefore, in supporting this Amendment, he could not be suspected of any desire of unduly increasing the burden of taxation. He hoped the Government before the closure fell would be able to give the Committee some assurance that they would seriously consider this case, the genuineness, fairness and justice of which they fully admitted. All they wished to do was to add at the end of paragraph (a) the proviso which the right hon. Gentleman himself proposed to add at the end of paragraph (b).

Mr. R. DUNCAN said the fact that some friendly societies had gone the wrong way was no argument against friendly societies, but rather an argument for the need of a capable public official to investigate their finances and give the public confidence in them.

Mr. GOULDING said that as the Government had not seen their way to promise to endorse thrift in their Amendment, he would have to put the Committee to the trouble of a division.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 62; Noes, 267. (Division List No. 143.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E)
Clive, Percy Archer
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Guinness, Walter Edward
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Goulding and Mr. Mildmay.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)

Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L (Rossendale
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,W. Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt HnA.C. (Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.

Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley(Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, Llewelyn(Carm'rthen
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

*Mr. HARCOURT said he desired, on behalf of his right hon. friend, to move to leave out the words "as disqualifies for registration as a parliamentary election," in order to insert the words "other than relief excepted under this provision." The Amendment should be read in conjunction with a further Amendment to make the proposal intelligible. The two were put down really to cover some observations of his right hon. friend the hon. Member for the Forest of Dean and the hon. Member for Stoke. The Government intended, and had always intended, what his right hon. friend wished to have inserted in the provision; but unfortunately some objections had been taken to the clause, and they therefore proposed to make it absolutely certain that none other than those intended would be disqualified. Disqualification for the franchise under former Acts contained, not only parochial relief, but "other alms." It was not intended by the Government to apply "other alms" to the disqualification for a pension. It was more than possible that parochial relief for a wife or child might disqualify a wife or father from voting, and it was also possible that the maintenance of a wife in an asylum would disqualify a husband from the receipt of a pension. This was not intended and never had been. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the variability of the decisions of the revising barristers, and a man of seventy years of age whose affairs placed him in a position to require and acquire an old-age pension was not the sort of person who would be able to appeal against the decision of a revising barrister. Under ordinary circumstances, he would probably accept with a certain amount of equanimity, his disqualification from the franchise, but when it came to the revising barrister's decision at the same time disqualifying him from receiving an old-age pension, it became a more serious matter. It was that they wished to avoid. The words of the hon. Member for Stoke, he suggested, were not wide enough. If they dealt in the Amendment specifically with medical relief, it was possible that they might leave in the disqualification for old-age pensions other things like free vaccination or meals for children or maintenance in a hospital or asylum. At all events, it was doubtful whether these would be regarded as disqualifications, and it was desirable to make that clear, because in the various Acts which had provided for free vaccination, meals for children, and support in asylums and hospitals they had been specially exempted from the franchise disqualification. The mere fact that it was necessary to put such an exemption into those Acts might suggest that they should be regarded as medical relief. Now they came to the question of the wife in a lunatic asylum. It was extremely difficult, or, at all events, complicated, to draw a very definite line between what was medical assistance and what was maintenance as a pauper. In the Act of 1885 which was designed to prevent medical relief disqualifying from the franchise, it was no doubt intended that temporary medical assistance should not disqualify but that maintenance in a workhouse infirmary or a lunatic asylum should disqualify. They proposed to except from disqualification under this Bill any relief given for support in a hospital or asylum. Perhaps it would be for the convenience of the Committee that he should read the clause as it would stand with the Government Amendments put in: "While he is in receipt of any Poor relief other than relief excepted under this provision, and, until 31st December, 1910, and if he has at any time since 1st January 1908 received or hereafter receives any such relief, provided that for the purpose of this provision: (*a*) Any medical or surgical assistance supplied by or on the recommendation of a medical officer, ; or (*b*) any relief given to any persons by means of the maintenance of any dependent of that person in any lunatic asylum, infirmary, or hospital; or (*c*) any such relief as by law is not a disqualification for registration as a Parliamentary elector; shall not be considered as poor relief." He did not know that that was very graceful English, but it attained the desired result. He would state perhaps a little less legally but more clearly exactly what it did. They dealt with medical relief separately and did not make disqualification dependent on the decision of a revising barrister. Secondly, a lunatic wife or crippled children supported in a hospital was excepted from the disqualification as relief not given to the pensioner himself or herself. Thirdly, the exceptions which had been engrafted by other Acts on the disqualification for the franchise were specifically included here as additional exceptions in order to avoid any inference which could be taken that they were not to be regarded as exceptions under the Act. Of course, it was perfectly true that they might have left the whole of this rather intricate matter to be dealt with by regulation, and it would have given a certain amount of elasticity, but he knew the Committee was always jealous of too much legislation by regulation and he thought it was desirable that matters of disqualification and matters of exception as far as possible should be set out in the *corpus* of the Bill; therefore he hoped the Committee would feel that they had met the general wishes of the House and be prepared to accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 11 and 12, to leave out the words 'as disqualifies for registration as a Parliamentary elector,' and insert the words '(other than relief excepted under this provision.)' "—(*Mr. Harcourt.*)

Mr. Harcourt.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said that subsection (*b*) of the proviso was of the greatest possible importance, and largely mitigated the hardship of the clause. There were reservations to be made in regard to (*a*) and (*c*), especially (*a*), but he thought the Government might consider (*a*) before the Report stage. There were very long debates in 1885 upon the question of medical extras, and if the Government would turn up *Hansard*, and read those debates, and read the speeches of the present Leader of the Opposition, they would see the exact point. It would be seen that there was a real difficulty here, and if the Government could widen their words "on the recommendation of the medical officer" into such a form as to include these medical extras it would be a great improvement to the clause. He suggested that on Report they might add general words including quasi-medical relief given or articles supplied in connection with burials and child-birth. He once more asked them to consider the question of supplying bread under the Poor Law where it was supposed in some cases to be supplied for the woman who had been confined, but was notoriously supplied for the children.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may point out to the Committee that they cannot discuss the later Amendment before the present Amendment is disposed of.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I should not have done it but for the fact that the mover of the Amendment rather invited it.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is perfectly true, but it leads to a certain amount of confusion if we discuss the later Amendment. In the special circumstances the discussion may proceed as initiated.

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) said he quite agreed with the Amendment as far as it went except (*c*), and he was extremely doubtful whether paragraph (*c*) did not re-enact the very words which the First Commissioner had proposed to leave out. He had read it four or five times, and quite understood what it meant. It meant any such relief as by law was not a disqualification, which pre-supposed that any relief that was a disqualification for the franchise was still to be sufficient to prevent the receipt of a pension. He did not know much about the English language, but he knew enough to make others understand what he meant, and they could generally understand what he meant. It appeared that they were merely striking words out in one form to put them in in another. He would much prefer that (*c*) was struck out altogether, because however they broadened (*a*) and (*b*), (*c*) was going to limit them. If it was left out there would be no ambiguity about it and that with the broadening of (*a*) as suggested by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean would meet most of the objections that had been urged. How necessary it was to leave out those words was shown by the fact, which had not been pointed out, that a man who was already receiving a pension might require relief. It could not be supposed for a moment that 5s. a week was going to enable a pensioner to secure medical or any other attendence. It was scarcely sufficient to keep body and soul together to begin with, and they wanted to be extremely careful that they did not leave words in the amended section which might, solely by the revising barrister deciding to disfranchise a pensioner, deprive him of his pension. He was not satisfied that (*c*) met the case put forward by those who had given notice of Amendments, and unless it was amended—not merely explained by a statement of the Minister in charge, because that could not be used before a pension committee—he should advise great caution before they inserted these words in the Bill.

Mr. W. R. REA asked the Government whether they would make provision to enable boards of guardians to give medical relief to a pensioner without charging him for it. It was not just to ask these people to pay for medical comforts out of their 5s. a week. It would not cost the Government anything to make this concession, and it would allow the guardians to do what they thought was just in such cases.

Sir F. BANBURY supported the Amendment, explaining that he also had an Amendment on the Paper in identical terms.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar), in answer to the hon. Member for Stoke, explained that paragraph (*c*) was not, as he seemed to fear, a limitation, but an extension. There were certain Acts of Parliament under which Poor Law relief was given without entailing loss of civil rights. The matters dealt with in those Acts included fees for education of children, payment of fees for vaccination, and provision of meals for children, and the Government proposed that, in those matters in which there was no disqualification for civil rights, there should be no disqualification for a pension. Replying to the hon. Member for Scarborough, he thought it would be within the discretion of boards of guardians to consider what the means of a pensioner might be, and whether or not he should be called upon to pay for medical relief. In answer to the right hon. Baronet, the Member for the Forest of Dean, he said the principle on which the clause was framed was broadly that relief which was not really pauper relief should not disqualify for a pension.

Mr. W. R. REA said there were a great many now in receipt of medical relief who would become entitled to receive pensions, and they could not be expected to provide medical relief out of 5s. a week. What he desired to guard against was that those who were now receiving medical relief should not have that relief discontinued because they obtained a pension.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON thought that would be at the discretion of the guardians. He thought that the point of the hon. Member was covered by the words "surgical assistance" contained in an Amendment standing in the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. What the House desired and what the Government desired was that those who received medical relief should not be disqualified for a pension.

MR. SNOWDEN submitted the case where old people in receipt of relief had the charge recovered from the children by the guardians. Would such a case disqualify for a pension?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he understood the law to be that if a man had adequate means the guardians must charge the cost against him. But was 5s. a week adequate means, and was the decision to be left to the board of guardians? He maintained that it ought not to be left to the guardians to decide, and pensions certainly ought not to be subject to the charge for medical relief. This question had been decided by Parliament twenty years ago, and surely they were not going back upon that decision to-day by making the pension chargeable to relief. He understood that the Postmaster-General had given a pledge to meet the difficulty.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he had already stated that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised to look into the question.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he wanted to know definitely whether these pensions under any circumstances were going to be chargeable for medical relief. Pensions ought not to be subject to such a charge. If this was not guarded against it meant that the Exchequer might be made chargeable for that which the local rates had hitherto provided. They did not intend that these pensions should be devoted to relieving the local rates. He was aware that the whole question of the relation of the Exchequer contributions to local rates would have to be considered, but it should not be raised in this way.

MR. HARCOURT said that the point had nothing to do with the old-age pension or to a limited amount of 5s. a week. The Poor Law authority had to consider in every case before granting medical relief what was the man's total income. While a pensioner with 5s. a week could not pay for medical relief, yet an income of 8s. *plus* a pension of 5s. might constitute a case where the local authorities would feel justified in asking for the contribution of a certain amount towards the payment of medical relief. They must not put a man who had 13s., partly his own savings and partly from the Government, in a different position from a man earning 13s. in wages. The only thing the local authority had to do was to look to the total means of the recipient.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said he was glad to see these words disappearing from the section. There were parts of the Bill which had been very loosely drafted, and of all parts this was one of the very worst. The Postmaster-General had not really explained the Amendment. The Bill as it stood made the franchise a test for the giving of a pension. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean and others had pointed out how complicated the law was in relation to franchise disqualifications. The Government had exempted from the franchise disqualifications: (1) Medical attendance; and (2) relief of dependents. He understood that under subsection (*c*) in other cases the test was to stand. Previous speakers had pointed out that obviously the words of the subsection were open to objection on the ground that they might lead to great difficulties and hardships. If they did not amend this now, they could not do it later on. They could not introduce Amendments in this direction on the Report stage, because they would mean an increased charge on the Exchequer. He understood that that was not permissible, and he appealed to the Chairman to say whether that was so.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have no authority to say what should be done on the Report stage.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said he understood a ruling had already been given on that point. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to look into the matter now, for there was really no use saying that it could be dealt with later on. Subsection (*c*) was really impossible as it stood at the present moment. Nobody knew what was meant by poor relief, for the law relating to disqualifications under the franchise law was most complicated. It took them back over a whole series of Resolutions of this House to the beginning of the seventeenth century, and, therefore, the meaning of poor relief would be a matter almost impossible to determine. He had understood that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to move an Amendment providing that the poor relief was to be at the expense of the rates. If he had done so, the clause would have been intelligible, whether they agreed with it or not. In Scotland, relief at the expense of the rates disqualified for the franchise. Unless the point was considered now it would never be considered at all, owing to the impending closure.

MR. HARCOURT said the subsection was an addition to the other subsections, and it was plain it was put in by way of dealing with the exceptions engrafted by other Acts to disqualification for franchise.

*MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD called attention to cases in which, though technically poor relief was given, it was recovered from relatives; and urged that they should not be classed as cases of poor relief. The right hon. Gentleman was perfectly well aware of the technical reasons that sometimes arose. A son or a couple of sons in a family declined to contribute, and so for the convenience of the other members of the family what was really a family contribution was made through the guardians. Surely the right hon. Gentleman saw that, although that was technically poor relief, in reality it was not so. This was a very small matter, but it was a very keen injustice in so far as it existed. He asked the Government whether words could not be introduced to make an exception in respect of that form of poor relief.

LORD R. CECIL doubted whether it would be possible at a later stage to correct the defects pointed out by the Member for the Forest of Dean. If the Government could not improvise an Amendment they ought to undertake to recommit the Bill for the purpose of dealing with the matter.

MR. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.) expressed the hope that there would be an opportunity for reconsidering the words of subsection (*c*) on Report. There was no doubt that the subsection had been put in to meet the cases of vaccination, education, and one or two other forms of relief, as to which Parliament had laid down that they should not disfranchise. It also brought in a number of doubtful cases which had been decided by the Courts of Law.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he regretted he had not heard the whole of the debate, but he had made himself acquainted with the point which had been raised. As he understood, there was some doubt as to whether the words on the Paper would cover relief in cases of child-birth and funeral appliances. It was intended by the Government that those should be included. If there was any doubt about it, and should it be found that they could not be included, on Report he would make a suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The Prime Minister had made an arrangement for the recommittal of the Bill on Monday in order to discuss the sliding-scale in the schedule. If the Opposition would be prepared to accept the discussion of these two minor details in the arrangement for Monday night, and supposing the Speaker found that they could not possibly amend the Amendment in the sense indicated on Report, the Bill might be recommitted, with a view to introducing those Amendments. He understood that there was a general desire that they should be incorporated, and the Government would be perfectly prepared to add them to the Bill if there was any doubt, though, as a matter of fact, he thought the words would cover it.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) asked the right hon. Gentleman at what stage he proposed to take the recommittal of the Bill, and whether an extra day would be given for the discussion.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said as far as he could gather from hasty consultation with his friends, it would be convenient that the Bill should be recommitted in respect of this provision as well as in respect of the sliding-scale.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said that what the Government proposed to do was on Monday night, when the Eight Hours Bill had been concluded at eight o'clock, to recommit this Bill, though it was not one of the allotted days, in respect of the sliding-scale, because they desired that the House should have an opportunity in Committee of discussing the sliding-scale. But if there were incidental points, such as that which had just been raised, the Government were quite prepared to extend the recommittal to those points. They proposed to suspend the Eleven o'clock Rule to give full opportunity for discussion.

MR. JAMES HOPE asked if he was to understand that if in addition to the sliding scale in the schedule, Clause 3, subsection (*a*) could also be discussed.

MR. ASQUITH said that he could not give any pledge about that. If there were specific points in regard to details which should be discussed he would have an open mind.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON asked whether they would have an opportunity of discussing the most important point raised by the proviso contained in paragraph (*c*) in the Amendment of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—

> "Any such relief as by law is not a disqualification for registration as a Parliamentary elector shall not be considered as poor relief."

He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way for a discussion of that point on the recommital stage.

MR. ASQUITH said he could not give any pledge about that, but it would be considered very carefully.

MR. SNOWDEN said he had not received an answer to his Question.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he understood the Question had reference to *Mr. Austen Chamberlain.* medical relief repaid by relatives. There was a specific Amendment in relation to that which had to come on later on; and he did not think it was quite relevant at this particular moment.

MR. DICKINSON said that the effect of this subsection might be that when a man who went to a Poor Law infirmary or a Poor Law lunatic asylum came out, he would find he had lost his right to a pension; that was a very serious matter, because anything which would discourage persons going into lunatic asylums or sending their friends into lunatic asylums or Poor Law infirmaries would be very inexpedient, and he hoped the Government would seriously consider the matter.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

THE CHAIRMAN was proceeding to put the Question "that those words be there inserted" when——

MR. JAMES HOPE drew attention to the fact that this was the only opportunity for discussing the Amendments (a), (b), and (c).

THE CHAIRMAN said he understood that the discussion of those Amendments was to be taken to gether.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked that before the division was taken, the Chancellor of the Exchequer should deal with the point raised by his hon. friend, which would seem to arise at this point.

*MR. MASTERMAN said that as his right hon. friend was not in the House when this point was raised, he would, with permission, explain the position. It was a point raised, not by the hon. Member for Leicester, but by the hon. Member for Blackburn, and was this—Where out-relief was being given by the guardians, and the whole amount was obtained by order from the relatives of the person relieved, did that disqualify for pension? As the Bill stood at present the answer was in the affirmative. But nine out of ten of these cases arose owing to the fact that some of the children would not contribute. One son would contribute 2s. 6d. a week, and another would not, and in order to get the 5s. a week a maintenance order had to be made and the old man was made a pauper. He would very greatly deprecate interference with that until the Poor Law Commission had reported. They might say it was only a matter of 6d. a week or 3d. a week loss, but unless they had some clear idea where they were going they got into a morass. He would imagine that nothing had given the Poor Law Commission greater preoccupation than this question of the maintenance by relatives. And what apparently might be a hardship must be borne for a few more months until this whole question of contribution to maintenance was reviewed.

Mr. WALTER LONG said he did not wish to squabble with the hon. Gentleman over what was a difficult technical question, but he thought he had not stated the question quite accurately. The morass to which the hon. Member had just referred was a morass which the Government had carefully prepared for the House. These cases of pauperism were extremely complicated, when pauperism occurred because members of the family would not contribute. The point was that pauperism in these cases arose from circumstances over which the individual had no control. This clause imposed a great injustice, and therefore this disability ought not to apply. When the hon. Gentleman said earlier in the evening that they were trying to upset the whole of the Poor Law system he was entirely wrong. He had overlooked the fact that under that system he had a right to claim a roof to cover him and clothes and food for his body if he was destitute. But the Government were giving another thing altogether. They gave a pension as a matter of right, and in order to fit their scheme to the money at their disposal they added this fantastic proposal. The scheme was hastily conceived, but that did not get over the difficulty the House was now discussing. They could not get out of that difficulty, because in a very short time other points would be raised which were new to the Government, and although the hon. Gentleman told them the mind of the Government was perfectly clear upon this question——

Mr. MASTERMAN said the mind of the Government was perfectly clear as to what was legal pauperism.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Then the mind of the Government and the policy of the Government are two very different things.

Mr. ASQUITH: The one is the expression of the other.

Mr. WALTER LONG said that if the policy was but the expression of the mind of the Government, in that case the mind of the Government must be in a remarkably confused state. Was there any man in that House apart from the Treasury Bench who knew what was going to be the Government's definition of pauperism which would disqualify for a pension? The fact was the pension committees would have to do their work with these impossible restrictions imposed upon them, and they would cast them to the winds, and they would be right. What would then be the action of the Government? The right hon. Gentleman had never answered the question which he ventured to put to him earlier in the evening. He knew perfectly well it was the crux of the whole situation. How were the present Poor Law and the Public Health Acts administered? If money was spent improperly, the authorities were surcharged, but if they knew that those payments were made with good intentions, they remitted them. Were they going to remit in cases where pensions had been improperly granted? They were going to lay upon the pension committees the duty of allocating pensions subject to restrictions. Supposing they disregarded the restrictions, what were they going to do? Was an auditor going to examine their accounts and surcharge them if they made a wrong pension; and, if so, were they going to adopt the same policy as they had in Poor Law administration, and remit if the payment was honest? If so, all these debates were worth nothing, because the pension committees would give pensions without any regard to the restrictions. They could not say what was a pauper, for they knew that a man was made a pauper by the interpretation of the law. People were made paupers by the construction placed upon the kind of relief they received. They were going to expose people to that ordeal, and the pension committees would risk it by giving pensions where they ought not. The whole thing, so far as the restrictions were concerned, was a farce. They had better remit them altogether and make up their minds to the extra charge, because it would have to be borne, whatever the House might do.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the right hon. Gentleman was labouring under a very curious misapprehension. He could not have taken the trouble to read the seventh clause of the Bill. His idea was that the pension committee decided not merely to whom the pension was to be given, but that they actually paid it.

Mr. WALTER LONG: A person is to go to the Post Office to get his pension. Is the Post Office responsible ?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that if the right hon. Gentleman had taken the slightest trouble to read Clause 7, he would have seen exactly what happened. First of all the pension officer reported. He was an Imperial officer. The pension committee considered that report, and, if it disagreed with the pension officer, the matter was referred to another Imperial officer. The final decision was with an Imperial officer. He had never heard before of such a suggestion as that a committee would disregard all the first three sections of an Act which they were called upon to administer.

Mr. WALTER LONG said that perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would allow him to call attention to the last words of subsection (*b*). If his description of the Bill was correct, what did they mean ? In the first case, the report was referred to the pension committee by the pension officer ; and, the pension committee—

> "After obtaining from him, if necessary, any further information as to the claim or question, consider the case, and give their decision upon the claim or question."

If these words did not mean that the pension committee would authorise the payment, as the committees of the board of guardians authorised payments, he did not know what they meant.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the right hon. Gentleman seemed to have read the clause up to line 25, but he would point out to him there were five more lines, and those five lines really decided the whole controversy. He would read them—

> "If any decision of the local pension committee allowing a claim for a pension or determining any question is not in accordance with the report of the pension officer, the matter shall be referred to the central pension authority and shall be considered and determined by them."

If they agreed, they were agreeing with an Imperial officer. The argument of the right hon. Gentleman was that a committee designed to carry out the Act of Parliament would not take into consideration any of the disqualifications. The pension officer, who was an officer of the Treasury, would, at any rate, carry out the Act of Parliament, and he would take into account the disqualifications. If the pension committee refused to do so, then another Imperial authority came in and the final decision was with them. If the right hon. Gentleman had taken the trouble to read the Bill, he would have found that it was absolutely unnecessary to have conjured up this idea of all the disqualifications being swept away.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he had not the same absolute faith in the judgment of the local excise officer as the right hon. Gentleman, nor did he envy the President of the Local Government Board the role of general supervisor and reviser of pensions which the Chancellor of the Exchequer allotted him. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board had said that the Government were acting on a principle, and that their principle was to follow the legal definition of a pauper. What they asked was that the Government should not follow an artificial definition made by law, but the practical definition made by facts. If the sons and daughters of a possible pensioner were defraying the whole cost of that person's relief, he should not be disqualified for his pension. He was not upon the rates, and he was not a pauper except in the technical sense.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 348; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 144.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.

Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray, Capt. Hn. A. C. (Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampt'n)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 17th June, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, and on any Questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 15, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that for the purposes of this provision—(a) any medical or surgical assistance supplied by or on the recommendation of a medical officer; or (*b*) any relief given to any person by means of the maintenance of any dependent of that person in any lunatic asylum, infirmary, or hospital; or (*c*) any such relief as by law is not a disqualification for registration as a Parliamentary elector; shall not be considered as poor relief.'"—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question, "That the Amendment be made," put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 17, to leave out from the word 'habitually,' to end of line 20, and to insert the words 'failed to work according to his ability, opportunity, and need, for the maintenance of himself and those legally dependent upon him. Provided that a person shall not be disqualified under this paragraph if he has continuously for ten years up to attaining the age of sixty, by means of payments to friendly, provident, or other societies, or trade unions, or other approved steps, made such provision against old age, sickness, infirmity, or want or loss of employment as may be recognised as proper provision for the purpose by regulations under this Act, and any such provision, when made by the husband in the case of a married couple living together, shall, as respects any right of the wife to a pension, be treated as provision made by the wife as well as by the husband.'"—(*The Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question proposed, "That the Amendment be made."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked whether the earlier words of the Amendment could not be put separately. Some hon. Members might desire to vote in favour of some of the propositions in the Amendment and against others. They were separate propositions.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: They are not separate propositions.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is possibly in my power to separate them.

MR. CAVE pointed out that the word "habitually" occurred twice in the Bill in line 17, and he wished to know which of the two was meant in this Amendment.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It is evidently the first one that is meant.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, lines 35 and 36, to leave out the words 'is convicted of any offence,' and insert the words 'having been convicted before any Court is liable to have a detention order made against him under the Inebriates Act, 1898.'"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 351; Noes, 89. (Division List, No. 145.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, Sir George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton

Asquith,Rt.Hn. HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonport
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,Sir J.H(Essex,Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh S.)

Dickinson, W. H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Ross'nd'le)
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R L. (Caithn'ss)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir Wlliam Henry
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.

Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alpor
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt.Hn.A.C.(Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph

Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas

Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward.
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton

Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Liews am)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount

Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel

Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Lane-Fox and Mr. Hicks Beach

Amendment made—

"In page 2, line 40, to leave out from the word 'direct,' to end of section."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 276; Noes, 158. (Division List, No. 146.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn.A.C.(Kincard)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)

Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J W.H.(Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnes, G. N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brace, William
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J.A.(Worc.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cleland, J. W.
Clive, Percy Archer
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm'gham)
Cooper, G. J.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Devlin, Joseph
Dillon, John
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haddock, George B.
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kettle, Thomas Michael
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meagher, Michael
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Muldoon, John
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richardson, A.

Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. George Roberts and Mr. Charles Duncan.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON (STATUTES).

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) moved that a humble address be presented to His Majesty praying him to withhold his assent from the proposed Amendment of Statute 4 of the statutes of the University of London, laid upon the Table of the House on 22nd May. He said that ten years ago a Bill passed through the House to re-constitute the University of London. On several points he felt compelled to oppose the proposal, but a sort of compromise was agreed upon. The object of that Bill was to constitute the University out of various teaching institutions in the vicinity of London, and the question was what should constitute the University. The Bill, which was passed in 1898, decided that the University should consist of the Chancellor, the existing fellows thereof for their existing lives, the senate, the graduates, and the students. The proposed change added to the constitution of the University "appointed and recognised teachers during their tenure of office"—that was to say, those who were teaching in the different colleges during the time they were recognised and appointed. He submitted that it must be borne in mind that the appointments of those teachers were transient and uncertain. The objection he had to the change was, in the first place, that it disturbed the balance of the arrangements agreed upon when the Act constituting the University was passed, and, in the second place, that it introduced a totally new idea of a University. It introduced a sort of lodger franchise. That was not in keeping with the proper idea of a University, and he did not think any other University in England would listen to such a proposal. If they desired to give the teachers a position and more prestige they could do it in other ways; but, if they became members of the University, it would follow that they would claim, and the claim could not be resisted, ultimately to become part of the Convocation, which was a body returning a Member to that House. Already they had sixteen members on the Senate. They had not qualified for the University at all, and they might cease to-morrow to be members of it. Yet they were giving them a power double that of those who had passed the degrees, and became members of the Convocation. The number on the list was about 900, but there were double qualifications; and he believed it meant about 500 individuals. Anyone who knew anything of the Convocation of London University knew that its constituency was scattered all over the country, and it was not easy to get together a large number of the members of the Convocation because of the expense, the difficulty and the time in travelling. These teachers, however, were all within a 'bus ride of the places of meetings. They lived close to the University, and would, therefore, have a power in the Convocation quite out of proportion to their relative numbers in the body of Convocation. The change had not received the general consent of any portion of the University. Convocation had, he believed, petitioned against it, and in a vote on the question they voted against it, with the exception of four dissentients.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) at this point called attention to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

House counted; and forty Members not being present—

The House was adjourned at half after Eleven of the Clock till To-morrow.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 30th June, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Blackburn Corporation.

Also the Certificate that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Public Offices Sites (Extension).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (Sevenoaks and Stourbridge Water Orders); Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (Potteries, etc., Order).—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.] (Bridgwater Order); Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.] (No. 1 Order).—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] (unopposed Orders); Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.] (unopposed Orders); Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.] (unopposed Order).—Reported, with Amendments.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.] (Unopposed Orders).—Reported, with an Amendment.

Wishaw Burgh Electricity, etc., Bill; Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [H.L.]; Garw and Ogmore Gas Bill.—Reported, with Amendments.

Croydon and Southern District Tramways Bill [H.L.].—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Fine Art and General Insurance Company Bill [H.L.].—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill. Order of the Day for the Second Reading read, and discharged. Ordered, that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Stockport Corporation Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Southwell District Gas Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill; Seaham Harbour Dock Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendment, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 119.)

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.].—Re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Minute of the Board, dated 30th June, 1908, modifying the regulations applicable to schools for blind, deaf, defective, and epileptic children, 1907 [Cd. 3636.].

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4049. United States (Porto Rico).
No. 4050. France (Budget for 1908).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS ACTS, 1877 AND 1907.

Order dated 18th June, 1908, entitled the Destructive Insects and Pests Order of 1908.

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD.

Thirty-third Annual Report of the Public Works Loan Board, 1907–1908, with Appendices.

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES.

Eighty-sixth Report of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Woods, Forests and Land Revenues, dated 29th June, 1908.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill the oposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on 16th June discharged, and Bill committed.

ASSIZES AND QUARTER SESSIONS BILL [H.L.].

Reported from the Standing Committee without further Amendment. The Report of Amendments made in Committee of the Whole House to be received to-morrow.

THE IRISH LAND ACT, 1903.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I have a notice on the Paper for to-morrow—

> "To call attention to the delays in connection with the provision and distribution of the funds required for the carrying out of the purposes of the Irish Land Act, 1903; and to ask His Majesty's Government whether they propose to take any steps to secure the effective carrying out of the purchase provisions of the Act; and to move for Papers."

I have been in communication with His Majesty's Government, and I understand that it will facilitate their arrangements if the debate is postponed. I am, of course, very glad to agree to their suggestion, and I intend to put the notice down for Wednesday, 15th July, if that will be convenient to your Lordships.

MARRIAGE ACT (AMENDMENT) BILL [H.L.].

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD: My Lords, I shall not occupy the attention of your Lordships for more than a few moments in stating the course I propose pursuing in relation to this Bill. It is a Bill containing, I believe, a very practical and useful reform. In substance it is to substitute, for the fifteen days' residence in a parish required now by law before a marriage can be solemnised, fifteen days residence within the diocese. That operation is not a very ambitious one, but at the same time it is one of great practical relief to the laity. A similar Bill was twice introduced into this House by Dr. Temple, once when he was Bishop of London and the second time when he was Archbishop of Canterbury, and was on both occasions passed by this House. It also received the strenuous support of the Episcopal Bench, who supported Archbishop Temple when the division was taken. In these circumstances I felt that there was every prospect of the success of the Bill this year, and that it was likely to receive full episcopal support. But I have received a communication from the most rev. Primate, who, in terms of great consideration, informs me that, although he had been a supporter of the Bill and had spoken on its behalf, he has now, with the knowledge in his possession, come to the conclusion that the present is an inopportune time for dealing with the subject. The right rev. Primate feels that there is great sensitiveness among the clergy in consequence of recent legislation, and that they might think the Bill was designed to disturb the position of parish churches. The Lord Archbishop also feels, I believe, that there are some details in the Bill which require further consideration; hence the Bill is not, as I had hoped, a non-contentious one. Yielding to the great authority of the most rev. Primate, I accept the view that the present is not an opportune time for dealing with the subject, and I therefore ask your Lordships' leave to withdraw the Bill.

Order discharged, and Bill, by leave, withdrawn.

CRIMINAL APPEAL (AMENDMENT) BILL [H.L.].

Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

*LORD ALVERSTONE: My Lords, there is a small Amendment in this Bill which I desire to make. I have carefully considered the observations which were made by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack on the Second Reading of this Bill, and as it is vitally important, in the interests of the Court of Criminal Appeal, that the Bill should pass as soon as possible, I propose to modify Clause 2 by striking out the words after "1907," and inserting words to provide that from and after this date the Master of the Crown Office shall be the registrar of the Court of Criminal Appeal. That will avoid all question of future officers.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): I think the proposed Amendment meets the criticism which I offered to Clause 2 of the Bill as it stood, and I, therefore, gladly extend approval to the Amendment.

Amendment made, and Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, this is what may be called a small Departmental Bill, though it is important in its results. The first proposal is to enable Colonial Judges who may be available to be asked to act as assessors with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the hearing of appeals from the Colonies with which they were associated. This was suggested at the Colonial Conference by the representatives of New Zealand, and met with general approval. The second proposal is to enable any person who is or has been Chief Justice or Judge of any High Court in British India and is a member of the Privy Council to be summoned to sit upon the Judicial Committee of that Council; and the third proposal is to facilitate the Court of Appeal in England receiving the assistance of any Judge of the High Court. These are all technical matters; they are reforms, though not considerable reforms.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

*LORD ALVERSTONE: My Lords, I desire in a few sentences to congratulate the noble and learned Lord on this Bill. With regard to the Privy Council, all I will say is that I believe the Amendment will meet complaints and objections made in the past. But I wish particularly to congratulate the Lord Chancellor upon the amendment of the law so far as assisting the work of the Court of Appeal is concerned. The restrictions imposed with regard to the calling up of Judges have been found seriously to impede the work of the Court, and I think this amendment of the law, though it may only be a small reform, will go a long way to obviate the necessity of the appointment of an additional Lord Justice. I, therefore, sincerely hope your Lordships will pass this Bill.

On Question, Bill read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON rose to call attention to the state of affairs on the frontier and in the interior of India; to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he could give the House any information on the subject: and to move for Papers.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, the Motion which stands in my name on the Paper has not been put down in opposition to the wishes of the Secretary of State, but in concurrence with them. It it not, therefore, in any unfriendly, and still less in any partisan spirit that I now move it. India is far too serious a subject to admit of partisan discussion on this or on any occasion. Like foreign affairs and Colonial affairs, it ought, in my judgment, to be lifted outside the squalid atmosphere of party contention. It is unfortunate for India if it is made the subject of party dissension even in the House of Commons in this country, but it is doubly unfortunate in its effect in India, where there are plenty of people always ready to take advantage of any apparent disagreement between the two parties at home, and where it is of paramount importance that the Government should represent a continuous tradition and should present a united front. I think that is a proposition which is true at any time, and especially at the present moment, when we are confronted with a state of affairs in India which challenges the very principles upon which the Government itself exists.

There is much in the treatment of this question by the Secretary of State during the past two years which has excited our sympathy and admiration. We know the difficulties with which he has been confronted; we have an idea of the cross-fires to which he has been exposed. He will, I think, be the first to acknowledge that he has received the not ungenerous sympathy and support of the Party to which I belong, and if there are some things on which we disagree with him, or which we think might have been done differently, and if we say so, I am sure that he will also be the last to object. There are, I think, special reasons for this discussion at the present moment. Since the noble Viscount entered this House he has found no opportunity of making a full and detailed statement to Parliament of the condition of affairs in India. I believe he will welcome such an opportunity himself this afternoon, and I am sure that it will be welcomed by the country at large.

There are some of us, also, who have an interest in India who have something to say, and it is not, perhaps, unnatural that I should feel that desire in a particular degree. A man who has administered the government of India for nearly seven years cannot lose his interest in that great country. In my case, indeed, it is coterminous with my life. Still less will he endeavour to divest himself of any responsibility which may properly be his. During the two and a half years since I came back from India I have not, I hope, said one word to embarrass the administration of the noble Viscount or to render his difficult task more difficult. I hold strongly the view that the actual holders of office, and particularly of Imperial office, ought to be left to develop their policy. Theirs is the knowledge—in the case of a remote country like India almost the exclusive knowledge—and theirs is the responsibility; and I should shrink from interfering prematurely with the development of any scheme of action to which an administrator of the character and calibre of the noble Viscount had set his hand. I cannot truthfully say that a similar reserve has been shown by many members of the Party to which he belongs. Many shameful calumnies and misrepresentations have been uttered on this subject, to which I shall have occasion to allude in the course of my remarks.

This Motion combines in a single formula frontier affairs and the internal condition of India. I do not thereby mean to assert or to imply that there is any connection between frontier troubles and the internal unrest in India. I have seen that connection asserted, and it is not inherently improbable; but I have coupled the two subjects in the same Motion solely in order to comprise them in a single discussion and to enable the noble Viscount to deal with both. I shall, therefore, deal with them this afternoon as entirely different subjects.

First, I will deal with the frontier. Your Lordships will remember that a few months ago we had a short discussion on the expedition against the Zakka Khel Afridis which was then proceeding on the frontier. That expedition was conducted with great rapidity and success by the military, and its result was, I think, a conclusive vindication of the wisdom of the policy which has been pursued by both Governments now for some years. When we hoped that all was quiet, suddenly, without any warning, and, apparently, without any provocation, we heard that the Mohmand tribe, a considerable aggregation upon the frontier, were bearing down in large numbers upon our border. I say without any apparent provocation, though I have observed that in certain quarters the railway to which the military authorities attach very great importance and which was being pushed, for strategical reasons, through the country lying to the south of the Kabul river is supposed to have had something to do with the feeling of unrest. Whether that was so or not I cannot say. Perhaps the Secretary of State can inform us. The railway did not threaten or go through their country, and I do not myself quite see why they should have been offended.

Here, again, in the matter of the Mohmands, owing to a really brilliant feat of arms on the part of our troops, the action of the Government was speedy and effective, and the frontier policy of which I have spoken again met with a triumphant vindication. Our fear has always been, with regard to that policy, that, right though it was universally admitted to be in principle, it was exposed to the danger of a possible breakdown under the temptations of religious fanaticism or the contagion of a general conflagration on the border. However, when the Mohmands advanced, no one came to their help. They appealed to the Zakka Khel, who would have none of it. They turned to the Afridis, who remained silent. They looked further north to Bajaur and Swat, and Bajaur and Swat, to use a familiar phrase, "abode in their breaches." Accordingly, this threatened trouble on the frontier subsided almost as quickly as it had arisen.

I congratulate the Government upon the success of their movement. And I think, if anybody had been disposed to doubt the success of the scheme of frontier policy which has been in existence for nearly ten years, his doubts must really have been dispelled by this occasion; and I hope we shall now hear no more of the wild-cat schemes for advancing into the tribal territory, annexing up to the border, driving roads through the tribal country and administering up to the Durand line.

But, in the course of this Mohmand affair, there occurred, at one moment, a very serious development. We suddenly heard that there was launched against the upper end of the Khaibar, a force emanating from Afghan territory, supplied with Afghan arms, largely consisting of Afghan subjects, its commissariat derived from Afghanistan, crossing the frontier by the aid of Afghan officials, and led by fanatical mullahs, one of whom was, I believe, the confidential confessor of the Ameer himself. When the Government of India, who appear to me to have shown extraordinary patience and forbearance in the matter, addressed the Ameer, there was a long and ominous delay before he replied. Finally, when he issued a proclamation recalling his subjects, the movement had already spent its force and come to an end.

This raises a very momentous question. I am as strongly in favour as any man in this House of the policy of a strong and powerful and friendly Afghanistan. The less we interfere with that country the better; and the idea of forcing on the Ameer any institutions or inventions either of peace or war distasteful to him would, I think, be a public mistake. But it is equally important—and this is the point to which I directed the whole of my aims while I was in India—that there should be an absolutely clear understanding between him and us as to our respective obligations and a faithful fulfilment on both sides of the engagements into which we have entered. We subsidise the Ameer. We allow the unrestricted importation of arms into his country. We demarcated the tribal boundary between our territory and his with his father, and each party then accepted responsibility for the tribes on his side of the border.

In the case of the present Ameer we have gone even further. We have made to him a remarkable, and, as I think, not altogether called-for concession. When the Dane Mission went to Kabul the Ameer was allowed to dictate to us the form of treaty. We conceded the recognition of a title which had never been asked for by or given to his father. When he came down to India he was permitted to claim, and he received, a salute greater than would be given to the Tsar of Russia or the German Emperor if they visited our Indian Empire. He was permitted to lay down the condition that during his tour in India no business of any sort should be talked. He was fêted in every way; and when he returned to his country the noble Lord the Secretary of State congratulated himself and the country upon the success of the policy that had been pursued. So far, so good.

But it was rather a disquieting thing that within a few months of that return we had an expedition largely composed of Afghan subjects let loose upon our border, and that the restraining word that might and ought to have been spoken by him was so long delayed. An alliance is not in an altogether wholesome condition when the subjects of one party are permitted to make raid on the territories of the other; nor, again, is it an altogether reassuring thing that we should admit the unrestricted importation of arms into Afghanistan with the melancholy prospect that they may, perhaps, be turned against ourselves in the future. I recognise the Ameer's difficult position. I have, personally, great confidence in his loyalty; but he is in a difficult position. There is always a strong anti-British party at his capital, and he is surrounded with domestic intrigue. But, while making full allowance for all that, the situation, as far as it is known to the public, has not been a satisfactory one; and I am certain the House will welcome any reassuring statement that the noble Lord is in a position to make.

One other observation on this branch of the subject. I refer to the Anglo-Russian Agreement. In February last we had a discussion on that Agreement, and the noble Marquess Lord Ripon told us then that the Afghan part of the Convention had been referred to the Ameer for his approval, and that without his assent that portion of the Convention would fall to the ground. The noble Marquess explained to us on that occasion that he attributed the delay in receiving a reply to the customary dilatoriness of Oriental procedure. Under existing arrangements it is possible to get a communication to the Ameer and to receive a reply from him in two or three days. But since the official communication was addressed to the Ameer containing the treaty in September last, nine months have elapsed, and it is notorious that no reply has yet been received. The Ameer is a very attentive follower of English politics, and he must be perfectly familiar with the views of His Majesty's Government. Whatever may be the result, it is impossible to believe that he can have regarded the Afghan portion of the Convention with any great enthusiasm. Indeed, I think anyone who knows anything of him or of Afghanistan would easily have foreseen that his sentiments would probably be of another description.

I do not think we can very well congratulate His Majesty's Government upon their diplomacy in this respect. They conclude an important international agreement which they frequently refer to as one of the most beneficial achievements of their administration. It involves important arrangements about the territory and the relations of a potentate whose foreign affairs are in their hands and who is handsomely subsidised by them. They do not consult this potentate in advance, though it is to me quite inconceivable that the Government of India should not have advised them in that direction. There is such a desperate hurry to conclude that treaty that the consent of the Ameer is taken for granted, and thus they subject themselves to the rebuff—for I really cannot call it otherwise—of having to wait for the best part of a year for a reply, while in the interval no human being knows whether the Convention is in operation or not. Nobody would be better pleased than myself if the noble Viscount is able to tell us that success has already attended, or is likely soon to attend, his efforts. I earnestly hope, for the sake of the relations between ourselves and Russia at St. Petersburg, and the relations between ourselves and the Ameer, that a favourable reply will be received. Though I have no great admiration for the treaty, though I have criticised it, not for its spirit, which is admirable, but for its terms, which I think were bad, I should think it a deplorable thing if it were to founder on such a rock as this. But my point is that this rock ought to have been foreseen; that anybody who had even a passing acquaintance with the Ameer or with Afghan affairs could have foreseen the issue. If the noble Viscount had taken the trouble to search the records in the India Office he would have found that when similar arrangements were under discussion in the time of the noble Marquess Lord Lansdowne, and when the Government of India were consulted on the matter, they laid down as an essential condition that the assent of the Ameer should not be assumed, but that the ordinary compliment and courtesy should be paid him of asking his views in advance. The only other observation I have to make on this question is that my Question concludes with a Motion for Papers. It is now some time since we had any Papers laid on the Table on the subject of Afghanistan, and I think it would be a matter of interest and advantage to many Members of this House and to the public if the noble Lord were able to tell us this afternoon that he would lay on the Table Papers on the subject.

I now turn to the internal condition of India, which is a subject of much greater anxiety and which will be much less easily composed. Events have been moving very rapidly during the past few months in India. It is a mistake, however, to regard the movement as a new thing. For years there has been a party in India implacably opposed to British rule in that country. We have had to endure chronic abuse and vituperation from a certain section of the native Press, and from time to time there have been explosions of racial violence inciting to disorder and to crime. There was such an explosion in the days of Lord Lytton, and there was another in the time of Lord Sandhurst, when he was Governor of Bombay. But lately these symptoms of unrest have developed with really alarming rapidity until finally they have culminated in what cannot be otherwise described than as a menace, not merely to Government, but to the very structure on which society itself is based in India.

I do not think that we ought to minimise this unrest any more than we ought to exaggerate it. In relation to the whole continent of India it is inconsiderable and almost insignificant. I suppose if we had any means of making a *referendum* to the 300 millions of the people of India, we should find that the enormous bulk of them were wholly unaware of the existence of this unrest. Moreover, there are powerful and valuable elements on our side. The princes of India, owing to the wise policy pursued for fifty years, are, I believe, unanimously and enthusiastically on the side of Government. Although attempts of the most sinister description have been made to tamper with the loyalty of the Army—attempts certain to be renewed—they have been so far, I believe, unsuccessful. The better classes of the people, the men who have a stake in the country, are also loyal—although noble Lords can scarcely have an idea of the degree of timidity by which these persons are actuated, or the degree to which they are frightened by the pressure, the threats, and the blackmail of the native Press of India. Though these are the favourable symptoms, from another point of view we cannot deny the seriousness of the situation.

When we read of attacks being made on Europeans in the great military station of Rawalpindi, of serious agitation among the peasants of the Punjab, of disgraceful riots in the remote and hitherto entirely peaceful corners of Madras, of prominent citizens being arrested for sedition in Bombay, and of the whole chapter of events in Bengal, it is evident that there is a movement in existence in India which has wide ramifications, which is backed by a powerful and unscrupulous organisation, which is supported by large funds, which does not spring from any local or isolated cause, but which is part of a deliberate campaign conducted against British government in that country. Moreover, my Lords, we must remember that, though the classes which propagate sedition may be numerically small, they are the classes which have almost the monopoly of education and the influence which education gives. They have a perfect command both in speech and in writing of the two languages—English and the vernacular—and they possess an influence with their countrymen greatly in excess either of their numbers or of their social standing in the country. I do not think, therefore, that we ought to underrate the seriousness of this movement. I hope very much that its dangerous symptoms will abate; but I think we must count upon the chronic continuance of unrest in India for the reason that the causes which are at the bottom of it are not ephemeral, but in some respects almost permanent in their operation.

There is not time, nor am I sure that this would be the occasion, for entering into any detailed analysis of the causes of this movement. All of them are complex, and some of them are very obscure. But among those causes a few lie on the surface. It will, I think, be admitted by every one that first and foremost among these is the education we have given to the people of the country. For years—indeed, ever since the days of Lord Macaulay, who may be said in a sense to be the author of much that has happened since then—we have been giving to the people of India an education which, however admirably suited to a country which has centuries of constitutional development behind it, is profoundly ill-adapted to a country where the traditions, the social customs, and the state of intellectual evolution are what we see in India. It has taught the people of India the catchwords of Western civilisation without inspiring them with its spirit or inculcating its sobriety. It has sharpened their intellect without forming their character. When we read the other day that in the personal property of one of these miserable bomb-throwers who was arrested there was found "Mill on Liberty" and "Burke on the French Revolution," we can detect the remote spark which led to the ultimate conflagration.

The second and very potent cause of unrest is, I believe, the ferment which is going on in every part of Asia at this moment, and which has been greatly, almost immeasurably, aggravated by the success of Japan over Russia in the last war. This is the first occasion for centuries in which in an open conflict between East and West, between Asia and Europe, Asia has triumphed. The reverberations of that victory have echoed like a thunderclap through the whispering galleries of the East. They have produced the progressive movement in China, the constitutional movement in Persia, the revolutionary movement in Russia, and almost the whole of the activity that has been manifested in different parts of Central Asia. In India, I can certify, because it occurred in my time, that they gave an immense impetus to the racial feeling in that country. They lent shape and confidence to the aspirations long formed in the native mind, and they led agitators to think that the time had arrived when the policy of deeds might be substituted for the policy of words.

There is one alleged cause of this unrest to which I hope you will allow me, in justice to our own countrymen in India, to refer. It is the charge often made that there is a change in the temper of Englishmen in that country, that there is a progressive loss of sympathy and a hardening of spirit and tone in our relations with the natives. It is suggested that there was once a time, 100 years or less ago, when we were truly in touch with them, but that at some period since we have grown arrogant and stiff, and are now incapable of entering into any relations of amity or regard with them. I do not think it is ever true that national character pursues these sharp or sudden zigzags, and I believe it to be quite untrue of our fellow-subjects in that country. If you look at the books that were written a hundred years ago—which is the Saturnian epoch to which the critics now refer—such a work as the "Journal" of Bishop Heber, who travelled in many parts of India a century ago—you will find in his writings precisely the same complaints about the unsympathetic character of our countrymen. But these charges, in so far as they were true, were true then of a minority only of our countrymen, and if they are true now, they are equally true of a minority only, and I believe a minority which has grown steadily smaller.

What has changed in India is, not the character of the Englishman, but the system under which the Englishman works. It is scarcely possible to describe the degree to which the official Englishman in India is the victim of a system more rigid than himself. The increase of population, the enormous rise in the standards of administration, the demands of education, of sanitation, and public works, the spread of railways bringing constant visits from inspectors and officers coming to see how he is getting on, the diffusion of the electric telegraph calling from him for information and reports, for answers to fantastic and ignorant questions put in the British House of Commons—all these constitute an overwhelming burden on the time of the district official in India, and leave him little or no time for that social intercourse with the natives, which is supposed to have been in days gone by the source of their confidence and of his strength. The British official in India is now surrounded by native clerks, by Baboos who talk English as well as himself; and that, of course, leads to a disinclination on his part to make himself familiar with the vernacular of the country. In these ways a gap is growing between the English and the natives in

India which is a most regrettable thing, but which is inevitable because it is in part the result of the operations of the Parliamentary system in this country.

There is another and very different respect in which Englishmen, or, at any rate, a small knot of Englishmen, have incurred responsibility for the condition of affairs in India. I am referring to the utterances, sometimes ignorant and irresponsible, sometimes deliberate and malignant, of a small knot of Englishmen who have been preaching the doctrines of self-government for years to the Indians, denouncing the British Government which they very likely have themselves served, and pouring contempt on the race from which they themselves are sprung. Some of these men have been members of the Civil Service, which they have left under conditions producing a sense of personal grievance in their minds. Some of them are English Members of Parliament, some of them are journalists, some of them are itinerant orators of the emotional type who pay visits of a few weeks to India to tell the people there what they ought to do, and then come back here and tell us what we ought to do. Nearly all of them belong to the extreme wing of the Radical Party. A good deal of their ammunition is, I believe, derived from the earlier writings of the noble Viscount the Secretary of State for India, although I fancy that they are very much disappointed with his more recent action.

These persons, particularly if they have M.P. added to their name, have a valuation in India greatly in excess of that which they enjoy here; and when they go to India and tell the people there that they are ruled by a Russian despotism or that the methods of their Government are worse than Armenian atrocities, it is supposed that they know something about Russia and Armenia, and are talking truth. It is possible to show that some of the utterances of which I am speaking have been directly responsible for some of the consequences that have ensued; and when we tabulate as I am endeavouring to do, the causes of this movement, let us not deny a prominent place to the pernicious action and inflammatory writings of some of our own countrymen.

I come to a question which has excited a great deal of attention—I allude to the so-called partition of Bengal. More exaggerated nonsense has been talked about this question than almost any other question of contemporary Indian politics. We are told that it is the main cause of the unrest throughout India. If the unrest were confined to Bengal there might be some plausibility in that plea; but do the peasants of the Punjab or the people of Tuticorin care twopence about the partition of Bengal? They have not the slightest idea what it means. You might just as well say that the rejection of the Scottish Land Bill by this House was responsible for the agitation in Macedonia or the outrages at Lisbon. We are also told that there was a sinister design on the part of the Government of India to create a race feud between Hindus and Mahomedans, and in particular that the partition of Bengal was an attempt on my part to avenge myself on the Bengalis for their hostility to some of the measures passed when I was in India. It is a calumny so preposterous that it scarcely seems worthy of notice. It certainly was an advantage of the measure of which I am speaking that the Mahomedans in Bengal, who represent a down-trodden and backward element of the population, should be gathered together in a province where there would be greater scope for their intellectual development and for their employment in the future. But the credit for that, if credit it be, was not mine. The ultimate form which the partition took, and which differed very materially from the proposals I put forward in the first place, was conceived when the Government of India was in the hands of my noble friend Lord Ampthill. When I returned to India, I found that he had courteously reserved the matter for my decision, and, knowing the sincerity and the thoroughness with which the matter had been discussed by his Government, I readily acquiesced in their views.

Now, what were the objects of the so-called partition of Bengal? Partition, I think, is in itself an inapt and undesirable phrase. It suggests a forcible dismemberment of the country, much as Poland was torn to pieces by its avaricious neighbours. The partition of Bengal was merely the readjustment of the administrative boundaries of that province effected by a duplication of the machinery of Government. It was as if the Home Office or the Local Government Board in this country were to take some county whose population had grown to such an extent that one county council could not well manage its affairs, and say that therefore it should have two councils in future. There were two factors with which we were confronted. The first was this. On the eastern side of Bengal lay the remote and rather backward province of Assam, with no outlet to the sea for its industries, and with only a service borrowed from Bengal. It was from every point of view desirable that Assam should be extended to give it the outlet of which I speak, and to enable it to have a Commission of its own. Then, what was more, I found from the reports of the officers and from my own inquiries that, owing to the enormous burden resting on the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, who had to administer a province of 80,000,000 people, there was worse administration and a greater chasm between the Government and the people in the east of Bengal than in any other part of India. We therefore decided to duplicate the machinery of Government, and instead of having one Lieutenant-Governor, one Board of Revenue, one Legislative Council, to give them in each case two.

That measure was received with gratitude by the majority of the inhabitants not of the old province but of the new province, and I venture to say it has turned out a great administrative advantage to the people. But it excited fierce resentment among a certain section of the people. It struck athwart the social and material interests of a number of individuals and communities to whom it was a matter of importance that everything should be centralised at Calcutta, and it also cut athwart the political ambitions of those extreme persons and agitators who looked in the future to an occasion when they might bring the undivided force of the whole Bengali race to bear upon the British Government in their struggle for political concessions.

All these causes operated when the measure was introduced, and, further, those feelings were enhanced by the manner in which the question was dealt with by the then Secretary of State for India. The noble Lord, Lord Midleton, the Secretary of State at that time, made a reference to the partition of Bengal in one of his telegrams, which undoubtedly led to the inference in that country that that measure had been thrown as a sop to soothe my wounded feelings rather than on grounds of political propriety or expediency.

VISCOUNT MIDLETON: Will the noble Lord quote the telegram to which he refers?

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: Yes. These were the words of the noble Lord. It was a telegram connected with my resignation, which, as the House knows, had reference to a question of military administration, and had nothing whatever to do with Bengal. The telegram was dated August 16th, 1905, and was as follows—

> "Throughout your administration my colleagues and I have endeavoured to give you constant support in the many measures of administrative reform you have initiated, including the partition of Bengal, upon which we recently adopted your proposals."

That sentence was universally read in India, and the noble Lord will see it by referring to the papers, to mean—especially when taken in conjunction with the tone of the noble Lord's own despatch about the partition of Bengal—that he had, so to speak, thrown the partition of Bengal to me in order to make matters as easy as possible for me in consequence of my injured feelings arising out of the manner in which he had treated me over my resignation. I do not say the inference was just or unjust, but that it was universally held is known by everyone in India, and can be demonstrated by reference to many sources. Those feelings have been enhanced by proceedings which have taken place under the present Administration. There have been more answers than one given in the House of Commons, notably an answer by the late Prime Minister, which have suggested the possibility that the Government are not unwilling to hear new facts or new arguments which might conceivably lead to a reconsideration of the case. The terms of these answers, although I believe quite innocent in themselves—I am not complaining of them—were undoubtedly read in India as suggesting the possibility that the Government might reconsider this question. Even now there are certain Members of the House of Commons, and a large section in India, who believe that if persistent pressure is applied to the Government they may yet yield on the matter. If the noble Lord in his speech to which we are presently to listen will state that the Government adhere absolutely to the policy which they have supported for the last two-and-a-half years, it will, I believe, do more than anything else to crush the agitation which is still proceeding on the matter in India. For my own part I can only say that any revocation or modification of the partition of Bengal —a measure accepted by two Secretaries of State, two Governments, two India Councils, of undoubted administrative advantage, inflicting injury upon no class or community, made a test case between the extremist party in India and the Government—would place a premium upon disloyal agitation in India in future, and render the government of India well-nigh impossible; and future Secretaries of State would rue the day and would not forgive the man by whom that concession had been made.

Then we are sometimes told that the unrest is due to the harsh and oppressive measures of the British Government, and particularly to the reactionary policy of recent years. I always suspect these cant phrases when I hear them. When a Conservative dislikes any measure he calls it revolutionary, and when a Radical dislikes any measure he calls it reactionary. I have never myself been able to ascertain what the reactionary measures were to which reference was made. There are several noble Lords in this House with whom I had the honour of being associated in the government of India, and I think I shall carry them with me when I say that in the years in which we worked together we carried a very considerable programme of administrative reform in the interests of the people of that country. We reduced taxation on three occasions; we gave large sums to irrigation; we reformed the police; we endeavoured to purge education of some of its worst blemishes and to supply it with funds; we organised agriculture and created agricultural banks. These measures were received with acclamation at the time, and I should be glad to hear from the Secretary of State what are the oppressive or reactionary measures of which the Government of India in my time were guilty, or if, indeed, he can find any trace of them.

I pass to the methods with which the noble Lord is dealing with the situation in India. Those methods have met so far with our cordial support. We applauded him when he ordered the deportation of two principal authors of sedition last year, and when he released them we accepted his judgment. We were glad when the Government of India issued a circular to suppress misconduct in colleges and schools, and when they passed a law to prohibit seditious meetings. When the noble Lord put two Indian gentlemen on his council in London, we thought it a most reasonable concession, and I am sure we are all prepared to give favourable consideration to the proposal as to advisory councils or the expansion of legislative councils which he may shortly put before us. So far so good. But these measures have been, perhaps, better in their intentions than in their execution. Certainly they have not altogether succeeded in their results. So far as I can ascertain the school circular has been almost a dead letter. I have carefully studied the newspapers, and seditious meetings seem to me still to flourish unchecked.

Then there was the calamitous action about which it is my duty to say a word—the acceptance of the resignation of Sir Bampfylde Fuller. He was an officer of great ability and courage and notorious for his sympathies with the natives, and he was engaged in the face of much obloquy and difficulty in carrying out the extremely arduous task of introducing the new administration in the province of Eastern Bengal. He disagreed with the Government of India on a point of importance, and was allowed to resign. I think the acceptance of his resignation was most unfortunate, because it gave a great impetus to the agitation and led agitators to think that, having got rid of the Lieutenant-Governor, they could also destroy the province. What was worse still, it was a matter of great discouragement to British officers throughout the country. It took the heart out of them; it lowered their *morale*. If, they said to themselves, the most conspicuous and able of our number, who is in the forefront of the battle, has been deserted, how can smaller or weaker men presume to hold the fort?

I daresay the Secretary of State will say that it is improper by means of a threat of resignation to hold a pistol at the head of the Government. I am perhaps entitled to speak on the ethics of resignation. To proffer your resignation is not necessarily to hold a pistol at the head of the Government; it is often the sole resort which is open to an honourable man who has strong convictions. That was the case with Sir Bampfylde Fuller. Did the Government of India invite him to reconsider his position? Did they give him an opportunity of explaining his views or withdrawing his threat? If they had done so, and he had declined to take it, I should not have stood up in this House to say a word in his defence. No such opportunity was given. He was sacrificed in the mistaken belief that it would pacify the agitators, whereas, as I believe, an entirely opposite result has ensued. If he had remained in Eastern Bengal, I believe it would have been pacified long before now.

During the last few months events in India have taken a more dangerous form. We have read with great horror of the attempts made on the lives of British officers and other persons, and these have culminated in the discovery of a conspiracy which has behind it all the diabolical resources and is animated by all the fiendish motives of the worst anarchist societies in history. With fearful rapidity we have seen the state of affairs in India pass from calumny and misrepresentation to sedition, from sedition to crime, and from crime to bloody anarchy. This shows, I think, that the treatment so far adopted has not been altogether successful.

During the past few weeks the Government of India have dealt with the subject by two measures. They have passed an Explosives Act which is a duplicate of a measure that was carried with great rapidity in both Houses of Parliament here in 1883. None of us has a word to say against that. They have also introduced and carried a Press Act. I wonder if the people in this country have any idea of the appalling licence, the shameless violence which characterises much of the writing of the native Press in India. There is a section of that Press which exists only for the vituperation of the British Government and the stirring up of race hatred between the two peoples. I might easily read you sheaves of extracts to illustrate my point, but it is sufficient for me to quote the words of the Viceroy, who, in a debate on this Bill the other day in India, spoke of a system of seditious writing and seditious speaking of unparalleled virulence as existing throughout India. There is not a country in Europe, there is not even a Republic in South America, where writing of this sort would be tolerated. In India it is peculiarly perilous, because there you have an alien Government conducting the government with only a scanty force behind it, and dependent to a large extent upon its personal prestige, and you are also dealing with perhaps the most credulous and impressionable people on the face of the globe. Every day they see the officers of the Government vilified, the Government traduced, and British rule represented as a harsh and infamous oppression. I noticed the other day that a bomb-thrower, who killed two poor innocent women, turned out to be a young man who had been had up for distributing seditious literature in 1906, and had been let out because of his youth by the Government of Bengal; and he stated himself that his mind had been inflamed by the poison of the vernacular Press.

Twice before now has special Press legislation had to be introduced in India for the purpose of dealing with this state of affairs. The first case was in the time of the Mutiny, and the second in the time of Lord Lytton. He introduced a measure intended not to punish that sort of crime, but to prevent it. In 1880, the Liberal Government came in, and the noble Marquess opposite arrived in India, and in deference to what are called Liberal principles, that Act was repealed, and ever since we have had to rely upon the indifferent protection of the penal code. I say the indifferent protection of the penal code because, although the penal code has been strengthened since that date, there is almost always a doubt as to the interpretation of the law. The law officers in India are usually averse to prosecution. It is attended by all the publicity and advertisement of public trial, and with native juries it is extremely doubtful what will be the nature of the verdict.

The Government of India have now passed a Press Act which deals with incitements to murder and violence. If I may presume to criticise it, it seems to me not altogether adequate. In the first place it sets up a rather cumbrous and dilatory machinery, inasmuch as the intervention of the local government is required. Then it provides for a conditional order of forfeiture of the offending Press, with a public inquiry and the advertisement that ensues, whereas, in my judgment, a summary procedure is better suited to the circumstances of the case. Thirdly, it allows an appeal to the High Court, with again the opportunity of a sensational trial, and possibly the overruling, on a technical ground, of the Executive. Surely when we are dealing with a conspiracy directed against the main principles of government and against human life, when the question at stake is the preservation of law and order, we ought not to regard this as a question of a judicial tribunal at all; it is a question as to which the Executive possess the sole responsibility. But it is my chief objection to this measure that it is confined exclusively to incitements to murder and violence, and that, being so confined, the great torrent of ordinary everyday incitements to sedition and attack on the British Government will continue. I feel additional confidence in holding these views because they have been publicly expressed by the Viceroy himself. In a debate upon this Bill at Simla the other day he spoke as follows—

> "It is quite possible that our Bills may not be strong enough. In that case we shall not fail to amend them; but the Newspaper Bill in no way takes the place of a general Press Act, and in no way ties our hands as to the future introduction of such an Act. In my opinion, a further general control of the Press in India is imperatively necessary."

It is scarcely possible to believe that the Viceroy of India should have spoken in that sense without the assent of the Secretary of State; and when he commits himself to the opinion, as the responsible head of the Government in India, that a further general control of the Press in India is imperatively necessary, I suppose we may assume that that control will shortly be assumed. In my view it is most urgently required. I do not think our action ought to be confined to incitements to murder and violence. I think we ought to deal with the whole range of seditious writing and speech in India, and I hope the Secretary of State will be able to give us reassuring information on that point.

I need hardly say that in urging action of this description I am not pressing on the Secretary of State any policy of panic or repression. There is surely no repression in suppressing seditious acts or speeches, or ensuring the protection of your fellow-countrymen in India. I have many correspondents in India, and they look to the Secretary of State with hope, not perhaps untinged with anxiety, for what he may say to them on this subject. He has stated that it is the first duty of government to maintain law and order. They want that promise to be carried out effectually, and not in instalments. It has needed the murder of several innocent people to give us the Explosives Act, and two years of incitement to give us the Press Act. Are we now to have a further torrent of sedition of the class I have been describing before the next stage is reached, and the noble Lord comes to ask for fresh powers? The point of view of the native and that of the European in India are different; I do not think either can be ignored. When the native sees the Government of India subjected to daily vilification, it is no good to tell him that this is a necessary safety valve, and that these dangerous sentiments will otherwise be driven underground. He draws the conclusion, if the Government fail to act, that they are afraid. The European's point of view is different. He, whether he be an official or a private person, looks to the Government for the protection in the discharge of his duties or his business to which he thinks he is justly entitled, and officials in India are looking to the Secretary of State at the present moment to give them fresh spirit to grapple with the serious and difficult problems before them—not in order to maintain their own selfish interests, but to uphold the cause of Government and society in that country.

The other day I had an interesting communication from one of the most powerful and intelligent of the native chiefs of India, and he gave me his views. He said—

> "If the Secretary of State at this moment, without in any degree abating his generous intentions with regard to the future, were to hold up for a period of twelve months, or even of six months, the carrying out of those intentions, and if in the interval, as a condition of granting them, he were to insist on the restoration of order and tranquility and harmony between the races, he would do more to re-establish confidence than by any other individual act. On the other hand, if he were now to announce the concessions he has in mind, the announcement would be attributed not to generosity, but to fear."

I believe those opinions are widely held, not only among Indians, but also among Europeans.

As regards remedial measures, let me say in conclusion that although we do not know what form they will assume, I hope they will be somewhat different from those which were published last year. Yet if the noble Viscount can devise measures for associating the people of India with our Government, in wider and more responsible functions than are now open to them, I am sure those proposals will not be received in a critical or ungenerous spirit on this side of the House. He will, after all, only be carrying out the traditional policy of the British in India. No one, either now or in the future, would wish to cry halt to constitutional progress in that country. We all recognise that it is the act of a wise statesman to broaden the basis of government, just as it is the act of the prudent financier to broaden the basis of taxation.

Any concessions which the noble Viscount is disposed to make should, however, be subject to three conditions. The first is that they have not the appearance of being wrung from him by fear. Let them be measures which, agitation or no agitation, he will be prepared to justify on the ground of their conformity with the best and permanent interests of India. The second condition is, I think, that British rule, which needs as much strengthening and support as we can give it, should not be weakened by them. To enlarge the Legislative Councils in India to a point at which the risk might be incurred of placing the British Government—which is the only possible Government in that country and to which no alternative is capable of being suggested —in a position where they might conceivably find themselves in a minority, would be an act of almost suicidal folly. It would not placate the enemies of the Government, it would alienate the friends of the Government, and it would embarrass the Executive to a dangerous and fatal degree. The third condition is that the concessions should be preceded by a resolute vindication of the authority of the Government, by the stern repression of those vile incitements to outrage and disorder of which I have been speaking, and by the encouragement of all the loyal forces in India which are waiting for the signal to come forward so soon as they can feel confidence that the Government are strong and will not be afraid. I venture to think that a very grave and serious responsibility rests at this juncture on the shoulders of His Majesty's advisers, and it is our earnest hope and belief that they will be equal to it.

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty for Papers respecting the state of affairs on the frontier and in the interior of India."—(*The Lord Curzon of Kedleston.*)

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Viscount MORLEY of BLACKBURN): My Lords, I feel that the noble Lord has in many parts of his speech said nothing from which I could in the slightest degree differ. His knowledge of India and the active and prominent part which he played in its administration for six or seven years give him a title to speak on India which, if it were not for my office, I could hardly claim. But I do not see why the noble Lord should have wound up with an appeal to me as Secretary of State to be quite sure to resist sedition and to preserve order. Anyone who is familiar with the history of Indian administration in the two and a half years during which I have been in this country responsible for it will do me the justice to say that I have never allowed anything, either popularity in the House of Commons or popularity among my own friends outside the House of Commons, to divert me for one moment by a hair's breadth from any action or policy that I thought order required.

The noble Lord has said that the introduction of this Motion has my entire concurrence. That is quite true, but at the same time I am seriously disappointed at the tone adopted by the noble Lord on one or two points. To them I will come by-and-bye. I will only say now that I think the noble Lord has not been quite careful to remember that we who are here to-night are not the only participants in the debate. There are keen and vigilant listeners in many quarters. There are, of course, the officers of His Majesty's Government in Simla, there are the political parties in India, those who are called the Moderates and the Extremists, and the European community in India. They are all listeners. There are also persons who listen in the fastnesses of Kabul, and every word spoken to-night by the noble Lord will find its way by this day week to Kabul. I think the noble Lord has forgotten those things—I think he has forgotten that we are a responsible Government and that we have to consider whether the language used or the measures adopted by us tend to play into the hands of those opponents of all possible or serious reform who are looking on our Government with a sinister gleam in their eyes and infatuated dreams in their hearts. Much of the language used by the noble Lord will be thought by those men to be helpful to them against their moderate rivals.

I always speak with the utmost respect of the noble Lord when he is upon Indian ground—his knowledge is so enormous, so sure-footed, so acute. I agree with him that this is one of the foremost questions that can engage the attention of the British Parliament. In my view, after considerable experience of responsibility, the question of India stands in the very front rank, along with two or three other questions, such as national defence, the relations with the Colonies, and financial matters. You can name no front rank question with which India is not on a perfect level in its claim to vigilant and serious attention. I know your Lordships entirely agree with that. I do not go as far as the noble Lord who once said that he was more proud, or as proud, of being a citizen of the country which had done the greatest thing ever done—that is, had established English rule in India—as he was of being a citizen of the country that defeated the Spanish Armada and produced Hampden and Pitt. I cannot read history in that light.

What does it mean? This is not an entirely idle or theoretical digression. It means that to have beaten back the dark and bigoted power of Spain in the 16th century from our shores and in the 17th century to have founded institutions and laid down principles which are not only the glory of our own country, but which have been made the model and example for the whole civilised world; and, thirdly, to have established the supremacy of England, as Pitt did, over France, in North America, with all the tremendous issues involved in that transaction. While I have every desire to think well of heroic shades, I think it indicates defects in the noble Lord's point of view when he places those achievements on a level with the achievements, grand as they were, of Clive and Warren Hastings and Lord Wellesley. That shows that the noble Lord is not sensible of the duty of this country to keep alive those great traditions and achievements.

When the noble Lord began by saying that India ought to be outside all party considerations, I began to be suspicious, because I have always observed in my political experience that when Gentlemen begin by disclaiming the possibility of a party attitude they very soon find themselves in a severely party attitude. I am bound to say that I see no difference whatever in the tone and spirit and method and tactics of the noble Lord on this most grave subject from the spirit and method of any ordinary party debate.

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: Oh, really!

VISCOUNT MORLEY OF BLACKBURN: The noble Lord quarrels with me for saying that.

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: I am in the recollection of the House. I made no sort of party or debating attack on the noble Viscount at any point. I rendered him the most cordial and sincere recognition of his services as Secretary of State and his attitude on all Indian questions. I promised, as far as my support is worth anything, my most sympathetic consideration, of any proposals that he may make. Really, to hear that my speech was animated by a party attitude is just as great a travesty of my position as is the account of my views of the Armada and the Government of India which the noble Viscount has given.

VISCOUNT MORLEY OF BLACKBURN: Well, the House must, of course, judge what is and what is not party criticism; and, after all, I am not at all surprised, because the greatest party struggles in all our history have taken place on Indian subjects within comparatively recent date. Now, my Lords, the noble Lord, in talking of the sources of mischief to which Indian peace is exposed and the sources of annoyance and trouble to which Indian officers are exposed, mentioned Questions in the House of Commons, and he made the very remarkable statement that such Questions were fatal or deleterious. Nobody now living has more reason than myself to dislike the questioning which has gone on for the last two and a half years, but it has not had the slightest significance or importance. It has taken up a certain amount of my time, and of the time of some of my officers, but not a very great amount; but does anybody suppose that democracy is going to be without its simpletons? Perhaps not even an aristocracy is without its simpletons. When the noble Lord lays down the tremendous proposition that the Parliamentary system is incompatible with the maintenance of our power in India——

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: I am very sorry to interrupt, but I did not lay down anything so absurd as that. So far from deprecating Parliamentary Questions, the noble Lord will remember that I used to revel in them myself in the House of Commons. All I did say was that the duty of answering them often imposed a heavy and unreasonable burden on the district officers in India.

VISCOUNT MORLEY OF BLACKBURN: The noble Lord used some expression about the Parliamentary system which implied that it was incompatible with the maintenance of order in India.

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: No

VISCOUNT MORLEY OF BLACKBURN: I am glad I was mistaken. However, I was going to ask him, and I do ask him, if he dislikes Parliamentary action, whether in another place or in this House, what are you going to do with your Parliamentary system? It is all very well for the noble Lord sitting there, now free from all responsibility; but if he was sitting on this side of the House he would feel that he had to carry on with a Parliamentary system in one way or another. I rather think he indulged in cheap and, if I may say so, unworthy irony as to the literary sources of these questioners, and some of their friends in England—Mill and Burke, and some contemporary writers. What are you going to do? Are you going to prevent them reading Mill and even contemporary writers? The noble Lord does not seem to see that we are face to face with an immensely difficult problem, and that the conditions are fixed on us. I agree that Macaulay and those other great men who made education in India what it was are responsible for a great deal of what has happened since. What the noble Lord's achievements were in the field of education I cannot accurately criticise; but I feel this assuredly, that any Government or Viceroy who takes in hand at the roots the present condition of unrest will devote all the powers of his mind to the revision of the education system.

The noble Lord spoke of the partition of Bengal. Now, I have never for my own part indulged in any of the accusations of which he has complained, and the refutation of which appears to have been his main object in bringing forward this not very fruitful discussion. The partition of Bengal was a proceeding I thought mistaken in its methods, but no language has ever fallen from my lips that has in any way shaken the conclusion that the partition of Bengal was a settled fact so far as I am concerned. I will say without any danger of being misunderstood that, when I consider all the circumstances under which the partition was made—it was a matter of adjusting boundaries and operations of that kind—I could never see why it should have been regarded as so sacrosanct. It may be it is so, and for me it is so because it has become a test, and by that test I mean to abide so far as I am concerned. But the noble Lord rather surprised me, and I am sure he surprised Lord Ampthill, when he said that he returned to India from his stay in England in 1904–5 and accepted without question what he found. I have been informed, and I believe rightly, that, while Lord Ampthill and Sir A. Fraser, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, were hammering out the final scheme of readjustment of boundaries, at every stage the noble Lord had communications made to him on every single particular from time to time.

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: No.

VISCOUNT MORLEY OF BLACKBURN: Here I am in a position of *tertius gaudens.* I must leave the noble Lord and the noble Lord behind him to settle that between them, and I hope that they will be able to do so. Now, as to Sir Bampfylde Fuller, the acceptance of whose resignation by the Government with regard to the partition of Bengal the noble Lord has so severely criticised —I have the pleasure of knowing Sir Bampfylde Fuller; I have had more than one conversation with him, and have a great opinion of his many gifts; but I am bound to say that I read with surprise a letter published by him the other day in *The Times* newspaper headed "J'accuse," and attacking Lord Minto and, in a lesser degree, and with a good deal of innuendo, myself. Now, Sir Bampfylde Fuller is a clever and distinguished man who has held high office in Indian Government. What does he do? He takes this moment of all others, when there is a Viceroy at Simla manfully struggling with enormous difficulties which nobody is better able to measure than the noble Lord opposite, to pour into the columns of the English Press what I cannot but call a vitriolic attack on that great officer. The noble Lord may defend him as he likes. I rather wonder that he should.

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: I did not.

VISCOUNT MORLEY OF BLACKBURN: The noble Lord says we were wrong in accepting his resignation. Were we wrong? Is it really to be submitted to this House that, whenever a Lieutenant-Governor or anybody else cannot have his own way, he is to threaten the Viceroy with resignation? I do not think that there has ever been a man who has occupied the position of Viceroy who would more stubbornly resist any such action than the noble Lord himself. If I had been in the position of a Lieutenant-Governor I would never have sent in my resignation to him, because I am perfectly certain it would have been immediately accepted. I can only say for my part that, so long as I am concerned with the Indian Government, if anybody tenders his resignation because he cannot have his own way against the deliberately formed views of his superior authorities, that resignation will b promptly and peremptorily accepted.

The noble Lord says that disastrous effects followed the acceptance of Sir

Bampfylde Fuller's resignation. That is entirely opposed to the facts. I do not think I can publicly name my authority, but if I tell the noble Lord privately he will agree that better authority there could not be. This is what I understand to have been the result on the spot of the acceptance of the resignation—

> "There was great jubilation in certain journalistic quarters in Calcutta, but no increased violence followed. As to insolence to Europeans, it almost entirely ceased, and when Sir A. Fraser, his successor, went to Decca some three months later, nothing of the kind took place. Nor has anything been heard of any recrudescence."

It is not, perhaps, particularly wise in me to say that, because I shall be told by-and-bye that my words are an inducement to violence. It is quite untrue to say that the resignation caused any violence. The measure was an act of most salutary discipline, and in similar circumstances I should take the same course.

Now about the frontier policy. We have had two large or considerable frontier enterprises. Both have been conducted with extraordinary military skill and efficiency and have been entirely successful. We have not had what the Government of Lord Elgin had some years ago—we have had no spread of conflagration along that dangerous and turbulent frontier, mainly because we adhered closely to the policy first laid down by Lord George Hamilton in 1898, and reiterated by Viscount Midleton in 1904, that we would not annex or occupy or plant posts or make roads in any portion of tribal territory. That, really, was the secret of the success of both those great expeditions. No policy could have been more loyally and faithfully followed by the generals in command, and by those who directed those generals, than was our policy in this case. When I remember what has been said about military autocracy, I am bound to say that there was in this case nothing of that kind. Lord Salisbury once said that one must beware of soldiers, for they would advise you to make a campaign in the moon lest we should be overrun from the planet Mars. For my part, I have found no menacing difficulty of that kind.

I must really ask your Lordships to pardon me if I do not follow the noble Lord closely, or, indeed, at all, through the Afghan portion of his speech. I wish he could have felt it consistent with his duty to leave the Afghan field as much alone as possible. There will be plenty of time by-and-bye to look around. Let us wait. The noble Lord talked of our reception of the Ameer in India last year. He implied that we ought to have taken advantage of that visit to strengthen our position with that ruler and to make him feel that we had conferred various favours on him—subsidies and the rest, enumerated by the noble Lord—and that these imposed upon him a corresponding duty. We did not say a word to the Ameer during his very joyful visit to India about reciprocal duties to us or any other duties; and when the Ameer went back from India he went without a single element of friction in his mind, and the good effects of our policy of leaving this powerful man to his own course was shown by what happened on the frontier. It is quite true that Afghans did engage in those expeditions, especially in the Mohmand expedition; but when things became dangerous the Ameer, to the best of our knowledge and belief, from his correspondence with the Viceroy and in other ways, did his very best, especially in the later stage of the Mohmand expedition, to act in that spirit of friendship which we thought, and rightly thought, had been cemented during his stay in India.

The noble Lord alluded to the Ameer's assent to the Anglo-Russian Convention. I heard his language on that point with the greatest regret. The Viceroy wrote to the Ameer on 10th September of last year, and on 29th September the Ameer replied that he was away on tour in the North-West of Afghanistan, but he would be back in Kabul in November, and would then consider the question. Since then he has not replied. Of course we only hear indirectly of proceedings in Kabul. The Ameer has his durbar to consider, and I suppose that in a durbar, as in any other assembly, different points of view present themselves, and there are debates. Oriental debates, carried on without the assistance of guillotine or closure, are probably more prolonged than our own. The noble Lord said he did not wonder that the Ameer feels no enthusiasm about the Convention. He used words implying that there are doubtful things in the interests of the Ameer in this Convention. These words are sure to reach Kabul. What is the noble Lord doing? He is actually leading the Ameer to think that, at the moment when we are on the eve of putting some pressure on him, there are those in England and in Parliament who do not at all wonder at his want of enthusiasm. Anyone who realises what a proceeding of that kind in this Chamber means must feel that the noble Lord has not shown a considerate spirit in relation to delicate negotiations, not only as to Eastern things, but as to some very important European things.

The noble Lord went into a very elaborate, careful, acute, and thoroughly-experienced analysis of the causes of unrest. I think I am able to accept and to follow him into almost if not the whole of those causes. I think his diagnosis about education, about the tremendous influence of Japanese victories, and the other elements which he mentioned is thoroughly sound; but he did not say a word, and I admit it was not his business to say a word, about the course which he would advise His Majesty's Government or the Government of India to pursue. Of course, one policy is very simple. It can be expressed in the pithy formula which I heard the other day—if I may be forgiven for using a profane expression—

> "Martial law and no damned nonsense."

Martial law and no nonsensical constitutional or other reforms—that is not the noble Lord's policy, I am perfectly sure; but I observe that everything that falls from him leads to the assumption that we must know and decide for ourselves, without overmuch reference to Indian demands and expectations, what form of so-called concessions we think fit to give them. I think the Viceroy himself was better inspired.

I cannot sufficiently admire the manful courage in India with which, without yielding to panic or exaggeration on one side or to disgust at their blind, reckless, aimless crimes on the other, the Viceroy is ever persisting in the path which he and we have marked out for ourselves. I think we can all realise the position of the Viceroy, surrounded as he is by influences of an alarmist kind. Lord Minto was appointed, not by my political friends, but by the Government of noble Lords opposite, and I can only say here, as I have said in another House, that between no two servants of the Crown is there a better understanding and a fuller confidence than there is between the present Viceroy and the present Secretary of State. I admire the manful courage with which, in the very speech in which he was bringing in his Explosives Act and his Press Act, Lord Minto said—

> "No anarchical crime will deter me from endeavouring to meet, as best I can, the political aspirations of honest reformers."

I think that is a very fine utterance—fine in itself and fine considering the occasion. We have no choice but to persevere in the path of reform. We cannot get out of our own history. We cannot leave the course marked out for us by the conscience of this country in dealing with what I am sorry to call alien races. In these days we cannot leave that out. I, for my part, accept the maxim of the French statesman who said—

> "In politics you ought to take nothing tragically, everything seriously."

The House will not be surprised if I say that nobody in it views more seriously than I do the crisis—I do not believe that is too strong a word—by which we are now confronted. We can only surmount its dangers and difficulties by looking calmly and composedly, that is not to say without energy and force, at the problem which confronts us. We may postpone, but the longer you postpone, the greater will be the ulterior difficulties.

I shall be particularly glad if your Lordships will take this from me, that it is not merely Congress men, it is not merely Moderates or Extremists in Indian parties. I read some Anglo-Indian newspapers, and I find there, not as violent, certainly, but just as sincere, the expectation and hope for improvements in government and administration as I find in the Press of a more angry complexion. I believe from all the evidence that reaches me—I do not work these things out in my own head—from the members of the Indian Civil Service whom I have the pleasure of seeing from time to time, that the Civil Service itself, the administrators great and small, will be as glad of an improvement, and are looking as anxiously for an improvement in administration as the ordinary politician. Therefore, if we were to take our hands from the plough now, I do not say to adhere to every word in the scheme which the noble Lord has criticised, because of bombs and operations of that species, we should be exposed not only to the fury, the blind fury if you please so to call it, of the Extremists, not only to the lamentations of the Moderates, but we should be disappointing a great mass of strong Anglo-Indian European opinion.

The noble Lord said nothing about what is called the Hobhouse Commission. It was a Royal Commission which we appointed a few months ago with a view to examining what improvements in administration were possible, and I believe that when that Commission reports two or three months hence a great mass of valuable evidence of the defects in the working of the Indian Government will be brought to light and suggestions of a fruitful kind made for their removal. There have been some complaints of excess of zeal in the Commission. That was inevitable, but I am confident that, when we get the Report of that Commission, when we get back from India the scheme of reform mentioned by the noble Lord, with the opinion of local Governments of that scheme, we shall have before us a body of material, not for the reconstruction of Indian government—I, for my part, have no such ambition—but for taking steps which shall do two or three very important or even momentous things. One is administration improvements, simplifying correspondence and appeals, and so on, simplifying the mass of writing which, as the noble Lord knows, is one of the curses of Indian procedure. Secondly, we shall, I hope, and I feel confident, do something to give the Indian population in all their grades some formal and authorised opportunity of handling some of their own affairs. As at present advised, and subject to further consideration, I would hope they will be not only advisory, but, though perhaps modest, executive powers.

I will not detain the House any longer with a further exposition of what is at present inchoate and without final and definite shape. There will, I hope, be something to limit excessive official interference; something, I hope, to stimulate the formation of independent opinions in local governments and in district governments. Whether or not the scheme, which, I trust, we shall be able to frame in concert with the Council of India and in constant communication with and reference to the Viceroy of India, will necessitate legislation and a direct appeal to Parliament—the scheme is not in a shape to enable me to answer that question—of course it would be idle to pretend to frame any scheme for which we did not expect to get full approval of Parliamentary opinion. I do not despair of that, and the noble Lord promised, as far as he was concerned, that there would be no particular criticism of measures of that kind, though he and his friends would, as they are bound to, look very closely into policy.

Then there is the Indian party, or parties. They will make a great mistake if they give up the hope which they have hitherto always professed in the justice and good faith of this Parliament. I have heard that a friend of mine gruffly said to one of those who was talking of their faith in Parliament still remaining in spite of a Secretary of State who, as the noble Lord said, has greatly disappointed them by his falling away from his earlier compositions—

> "You are worshipping a blind and deaf divinity."

I do not agree. I do not believe that Parliament wishes either to be blind or deaf to any reasonable demands from India, provided those demands are made and pressed in a reasonable way and are kept clear of madness and of wicked crimes; and if they are backed by the responsible executive Government, I have no fear of those demands not being complied with.

One or two matters I have left out because I do not want to detain your Lordships. There was a certain passage between the noble Lord and Lord Midleton. In that passage I was *tertius gaudens*. I was sorry for it, because, if I may say so without impertinence, it is of great importance in the face of India that those leading public men who take part in Indian discussions should abstain, as far as they possibly can, whether in despatches or otherwise, from anything calculated to make the people believe that we look for a moment to any personal considerations of one kind or another in view of the tremendous issues by which we are confronted. I thank your Lordships for your consideration.

*The Earl of CROMER: My Lords, I do not propose to deal at all with frontier affairs, or with the very delicate question of our relations with the Ameer of Afghanistan. My remarks also about the internal condition of India will be extremely brief, for I think, in dealing with Indian, and, indeed, with Eastern affairs generally, deeds rather than words are required. My only reason for intervening in the debate is that I am of opinion that, in the present condition of affairs in India, it is the duty of all those who have any Indian experience to rally round the authorities and give them whatever support is in their power in the very arduous and responsible task which devolves upon them.

Let me first deal with one point which is really one of detail. I allude to the retirement of Sir Bampfylde Fuller. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the details of Sir Bampfylde Fuller's retirement to be able to speak about it with any degree of confidence. But I should like to tell your Lordships how the matter strikes me. Of course, no Government in the world can stand a subordinate official putting a pistol to its throat and enforcing his views at the risk of resignation. There is, however, another method of dealing with questions of this sort which are not very uncommon. I do not think that, in the course of my rather lengthy experience, in spite of the very numerous occasions on which it was my misfortune to disagree with the Government which I served, I ever sent in my resignation; but I have known a great many cases of others doing so. I will tell your Lordships how I have seen affairs of this kind treated. The resignation was always accepted, but at the same time a firm but friendly private letter was written to the official pointing out that he was doing an unwise thing in his own interest and in the interests of the public service in insisting upon resigning. I have never known this procedure to fail, and it has the advantage of preventing a good deal of dirty linen from being washed in public.

I am in entire concurrence with the noble Lord behind me (Lord Curzon) in thinking that by far the most important cause of all in producing the present unrest in India is the system of education. We are really only reaping the harvest which we have ourselves sown. We all agree with what Lord Macaulay, who was the father of that system, said, that it would be an ignoble policy to keep the natives of India ignorant in order that they should be submissive; but, at the same time, and without departing in any way from the main principles of Lord Macaulay's policy, it would have been possible to have adapted the whole of the system more skilfully to the special requirements of the country. The main defects of the educational system in India are twofold. In the first place, the education is far too literary; insufficient attention is paid to professional, technical and industrial education. Moreover, not enough attention has been paid to elementary education, with the result that nothing has been done to temper the ignorance of the masses. If we had tried we could not have succeeded better in producing the maximum amount of political inconvenience. On the one hand we turn out from our colleges a number of youths, highly but somewhat superficially educated, not nearly all of whom are able to find employment. Lord Stowell once said that, if the supply of educated talent largely exceeded the demand, the surplus was likely to turn sour. That is what has happened in India. Not content with this, however, not only have we adopted the best method possible to manufacture demagogues, but by not instituting any system of elementary education we have provided the best possible field for the demagogues wherein to sow their pernicious and subversive doctrines. I was very glad, therefore, to hear from the Secretary of State that one of the first articles in his programme of reform would be that of education. Let us, even at this late hour, endeavour to rectify our mistakes and encourage technical, professional, and industrial education, and do something also for elementary education.

But we have now to deal with the present, and not with the past or remote future. There can be no doubt that we have full reason for realising the truth of one of the declarations made by Lord Macaulay, namely, that—

> "You cannot impart knowledge without stimulating ambition."

We have imparted knowledge to some classes in India, and we have therefore stimulated their ambition. They wish to take a greater share in the government of India, and their aspirations are perfectly legitimate. I trust, therefore, that we shall continue to follow the policy which will increase their share in the government of the country.

I was glad to hear the Secretary of State say that nothing had occurred recently which should deter the Government from undertaking the execution of a wise and moderate policy of reform, although, of course, there can be no question of the rapid introduction of extreme Parliamentary institutions into India, which nobody except very great Extremists wish for. Even if the noble Viscount had not been able to give that assurance, his antecedents and the well-known opinion of the Viceroy—who recently delivered an admirable speech at Simla, and about whom the noble Viscount spoke in complimentary terms—would of themselves have provided a quite sufficient guarantee that no retrograde policy would be adopted. On the other hand, we should be under no delusion as to the results to be obtained by a policy of moderate reform. Because there are Extremists in India it is not a reason for deterring us from embarking on a policy of moderate reform, though it will not satisfy those holding extreme views. The Extremists will continue to exist.

I was glad, therefore, to hear that strong measures are being resorted to against those who disturb the public peace, that the law has been strengthened, and that an attempt is being made to curb the Indian Press. Twenty-five years ago, as a member of the Indian Legislative Council, I voted in favour of the repeal of Lord Lytton's Press Act. Since that time I have persistently refused to yield to the strong pressure put upon me in Egypt under similar circumstances to curb the native Press. The policy of complete freedom of the Press in India and in Egypt has not only had a prolonged trial, but it has had a fair and even a sympathetic trial. But I am bound most reluctantly to admit that I fear it has not proved successful. I am afraid that we have received another object-lesson of the enormous difficulties of applying Western ideas to Eastern facts.

The East, in fact, refuses to assimilate the notions which we, with the best intentions, but possibly with mistaken ideas, endeavour to force upon the people. I say that we have endeavoured to force ideas on the East because I have good reason for knowing that many of the best among Eastern authorities, and I should say that the majority of the most worthy portion of the community are not in favour of the freedom of the Press. I have over and over again had pressed upon me by Orientals of high character who could speak with authority on the subject the view that the vernacular Press did not represent any public opinion which existed, but that it created a spurious kind of opinion which would not have been called into existence at all had it not been for this Press, leading often to a tyrannous amount of blackmailing; and that the advantages derived from the system are incomparably less than the very great disadvantages. I do not say that in a matter of this kind we should be governed entirely by local opinion; we have to look at it from a different and rather wider point of view. At the same time, public opinion has to be taken into account, and I have no doubt whatever what the local or Oriental view of this question is.

I do not, of course, say for a moment that, even if my view of the question is accepted as correct, that is any reason for leaping from the extreme of licence to the extreme of oppression. I am aware that a Bill has been recently adopted in India dealing with certain Press offences, incitement to murder, and, I think, violence. I think it must be regarded as an experimental measure, and I believe that if the Viceroy and the noble Lord, in both of whom the country have the fullest confidence, after further experience think that further measures are necessary in the direction of placing more control on the Press, they will receive the cordial support, not only of Parliament, but of the world that stands outside Parliament. One of the great difficulties in dealing with the question up to the present time has been that public opinion in this country was not prepared to receive with favour a measure which ran strongly counter to our national traditions and ideas. But there are not wanting symptoms to show that in this respect there is a change in public opinion going on; so that, if the necessity arises, I hope that the Government will not hesitate to deal with the problem, even at the expense of some sacrifice of consistency.

I read in the newspapers a short time ago that steps had been taken by the Government of India designed to stop a native delivering seditious harangues. This measure might perhaps be advantageously adopted in the case of the classes to whom Lord Curzon alluded and who periodically visit India in order to associate themselves with the sedition-mongers in India. I do not attempt to argue with these gentlemen, because I am aware that they are impervious to argument. I do not want to impugn their motives or to use hard words about them. I prefer to take the more charitable view, which consists in thinking that they are so little acquainted with the facts with which they have to deal that they are unaware of the extent to which they are playing with fire. But I do say that the classes to whom I allude are the very worst enemies of their own clients and of the moderate reformer. If, partly in consequence of the violent language used by the classes to which I refer, further outrages take place—and such a contingency is by no means impossible—we may predict with certainty what will occur here. There will be a violent reaction and a demand for stronger repressive measures. Moreover, the whole of history is there to show that when once measures of that kind are taken under the influence of national excitement and under a cry for vengeance, as it is called, they are apt to go a great deal further than the requirements of the case demand. I should, therefore, very much like to see the Government of India armed with sufficient legal power to take action against those of our own countrymen who go to India and deliberately assume the *role* of Indian demagogues.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON: My Lords, when I came down to your Lordships' House to-night I did not feel at all certain that it would be necessary for me to trouble you on this occasion. I am not clear that on a Motion of this character very much can be gained even by what we may say which supports the Government; while I am quite sure that almost every word of criticism will permeate throughout India, and is likely to do serious damage at a very critical moment. I should, therefore, have been very content, after the clear and outspoken language of the Secretary of State and the support which he has received from the noble Earl who has just sat down, to have abstained from any criticism of what has been said this evening. But language has been used which, quite apart from whether it was fair or not to the Government that preceded the one now in office, was certainly calculated to convey false impressions on two high questions of policy, on which it was at least reasonable that someone from this Bench should say a few words. I propose to confine what I have to say very strictly to those two points.

The noble Lord who introduced the Motion spoke in rather scathing terms of the conduct of both Governments in relation to the Ameer of Afghanistan. He said that the Ameer had been the subject of some not altogether called for concessions, and he described those concessions, as a sort of rake's progress, for which he attributed about an equal measure of blame to the late Government and to the present Administration. The first of those remarks was that the Ameer was allowed to dictate to us the form of the treaty which was made by Sir Louis Dane. I altogether challenge that statement. I do not think there is any foundation for it at all. Your Lordships are probably aware of the conditions under which Sir Louis Dane went to Afghanistan to negotiate a treaty with the Ameer. We had had a treaty, negotiated, I think, first in the time of Lord Dufferin, with the father of the present Ameer. That treaty during twenty-two years secured to the British Government the control of the foreign policy of Afghanistan, and also ensured relations which remained friendly throughout that period, and which, on our side, were the subject of a subsidy which was subsequently increased after the Durand agreement.

Those agreements, without renewal by treaty, might have been held, and were held, to be personal to the preceding Ameer. They required to be confirmed with the present Ameer, and the situation when Sir Louis Dane went to Kabul in 1904 was this. No agreement had been come to with the Ameer; on the other hand, the Indian Government had, in certain cases, exercised the right, for which they had agreed with his father, of carrying on negotiations in a foreign matter on his behalf; but the Ameer had received no subsidy since the death of his father, except arrears which had been due to his father. The Ameer's statement from the very first was that he desired to renew fully the agreement as it had existed with his father, and he had this, at least, to urge—that he had observed the agreement with his father in leaving his foreign policy in our hands, while, of course, he had not received the subsidy.

A form of treaty was suggested to the Ameer, and he proposed a much shorter, and, in his opinion, simpler form of treaty which did convey precisely the recognition of the obligations which his father had entered into, and which had preserved not merely peace between India and Afghanistan, but the peace of the frontier during twenty-two years. We examined both those treaties; we took the highest legal advice as to the effect of the treaty proposed by the Ameer, and we decided that we were willing to accept that form of words which was subsequently presented to Parliament, and which, so far as I am aware, has never been made the subject of a single criticism in this country; nor could the noble Lord, with all his ability, I believe, show us a single particular in which, in the four years that have since passed, the acceptance of those words in preference to the more elaborate treaty put forward by the Indian Government has led to difficulty or trouble of any description. I cannot help feeling that it is unwise to represent the Ameer as having scored a heavy triumph, and as having dictated to the Indian Government under circumstances such as those which I have just detailed.

As regards the further matter connected with the negotiations with the Ameer, that has been fully dealt with by the noble Viscount opposite. The questions of title have not been touched. The conclusion of the noble Lord that our alliance is not in a wholesome condition is one which, I think, requires more to substantiate it than the mere fact that the Ameer's orders to his subjects to withdraw had not reached them at the time when they did withdraw. When the noble Lord talks of a rebuff administered by the Ameer to this country, I cannot help asking whether that is wise language, and whether it is desirable that it should go forth on such authority as his, in view of delicate negotiations which are still going on.

The noble Lord also touched on an internal question of great importance. The partition of Bengal is a subject on which a great deal has been written in reference to the present agitation, but we heard something about it to-night which was altogether new. When I went to the India Office in 1903, I found a large file of papers and I found also some most able and interesting memoranda by the noble Lord. In February, 1904, before the noble Lord came home on a holiday, he having, according to statute, resigned the office of Viceroy, the noble Lord made a progress in some of the districts affected, and by a number of speeches commended a change to the notice of the inhabitants. He returned to England in May, 1904, and he was away from India until December. He put forward a fresh scheme, the previous scheme having been discussed during the period that he was in England. He put forward the fresh scheme in February, 1905. The noble Lord told us to-day, to my astonishment, that the responsibility for that scheme must really lie with the noble Lord, Lord Ampthill, who filled the office of Viceroy in his absence; and he made a further allegation to which I will allude in a moment. The noble Lord framed the first scheme before the period when he came to England——

LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: No! Am I the noble Lord referred to?

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON: Certainly. The fresh scheme also came from his Government. I said he framed the scheme because responsibility is with the head of the Government. While he was in England the noble Lord was in continual correspondence with the acting Viceroy on public matters, and I have every reason to believe that he received papers from India about this scheme and a number of other matters. I know myself that he was supplied with information from the India Office on every paper which we thought might be material to him in taking up the duties which again awaited him when he returned to India, and the new scheme was put forward in February, 1905. That scheme also underwent some discussion, and I can only say—and I say it without fear of making any revelation because it has been mentioned in the Resolution of the Government of India which was presented to Parliament—other proposals were made, and the noble Lord most vehemently objected to the substitution of any proposal for the scheme which was finally submitted in 1905, and which he now attributes to the inspiration of Lord Ampthill.

I confess that astonishment could hardly have gone further. But I was destined to a still further shock when the noble Lord, after having endeavoured to transfer, as I understand, the responsibility of this change to Lord Ampthill, put upon my shoulders the responsibility for the agitation in Bengal, because of the inclusion in the Blue-book of a certain telegram, part of which at my instance he was good enough to read to your Lordships, and in which I alluded to the partition of Bengal as one of the great measures in respect of which His Majesty's Government had given the Viceroy their support. May I read the words again, in order that your Lordships may see how entirely the interpretation which the noble Lord put upon them is foreign to their general sense?

LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: I did not put that interpretation upon them. I said that public opinion in India had put it upon them.

*VISCOUNT MIDLETON: Then may I ask this question? The noble Lord has great experience of public opinion in India. Why did not the noble Lord warn me, when he was discussing what telegrams should be published, that this was one which might have a sinister interpretation placed upon it? If it did not occur to the noble Lord that that was so, why am I to be censured for telling the noble Lord that I had given him my best support in that as in all other measures? I telegraphed on 16th August, 1905—

> "I have learned your decision to resign with very deep regret. Throughout your administration since your appointment as Governor-General in 1898, my colleagues and I have endeavoured to give you constant support in the many measures of administrative reform which you have initiated, including the partition of Bengal, upon which we recently adopted your proposals."

I do not think that anybody can rightly assert that those words could be read—and they evidently were not read by Lord Curzon—as likely in any way to impede the course of administration in India; because I particularly alluded to that telegram, amongst others which recapitulated at length the whole circumstances, and invited the noble Lord to express his opinion as to whether it should be made public; and, although in the case of several telegrams he expressed his opinion that they should not be made public, he specifically, three days afterwards, included that telegram as one which he desired should be put before the world.

I trust your Lordships will pardon me for having gone at this length into what may seem a personal matter, but I have done so only in order that I may show that the last thing which we desired was to say a word hostile to the Viceroy. I had the advantage at the India Office, as the noble Viscount opposite has, of seeing every week or fortnight a digest of the views of the leading Indian newspapers translated for our benefit. I may be wrong—three years have elapsed—but I never remember on any single occasion seeing an allusion to this telegram which has been brought before your Lordships to-night, as being the pivot of the agitation which we all deplore. And I will say this one word in leaving the subject. I had the misfortune to differ from the noble Lord, representing the unanimous opinion of my colleagues in that difference, but never on any occasion have I said one word in public in criticism of the noble Lord or his administration. I have spoken before and since his resignation with genuine admiration of the hard work done by the noble Lord, of the lucidity of his intellect, of the extent of his knowledge, and of the supreme importance of the reforms which in many cases he achieved. I should like to add that I never knew any man in my life who was less conscious how completely his personality dominated the whole Government of India, and how impossible it would have been for the Government at home, without risk of a serious breach, to impede his policy or infringe what was his legitimate province.

I do not desire to occupy your Lordships' attention any longer, except to say one thing in reference to the speech of the noble Viscount the Secretary of State for India. Our only desire on this side of the House is to fortify his hands, and the hands of the Viceroy. We hope that no amount of agitation and no amount of unwisdom will prevent the Government from proceeding on the course of reform sketched out for them and suggested by the noble Earl. At the same time we also trust that no amount of fear of consequences and of political trouble in this country will prevent their taking whatever measures are really necessary to secure the suppression—the early suppression—of this agitation, and to make it clear that the Government of India is strong enough to make itself felt when occasion requires.

LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, I am reluctantly obliged to ask for your attention for a few minutes. I should have been better pleased if this discussion had not gone further than was necessary to elicit from the noble Viscount the Secretary of State for India the extremely important, and, if I may say so, inspiring statement which he made with regard to affairs in that country. But my own name has been mentioned in the course of the discussion. My noble friend gave me credit for a share in that act of statesmanship which is known as the partition of Bengal, and the noble Viscount the Secretary of State rather challenged me to say if that was so or not.

My noble friend has on more than one public occasion been very generous in giving me a share of credit—more than I have deserved—for acts of administration in which I bore a small part under his Government. I have been grateful on those occasions, and I have been, and always shall be, ready to share with him, so far as it is due, any responsibility which can properly be placed upon me. But I am bound to say, challenged as I am, that no share of the credit for the partition of Bengal is due to me. I was, as your Lordships will believe, quite unprepared for this statement, and I can only rely upon my memory, but my memory is very clear on this subject. When it devolved upon me to act as *locum tenens* in the office of Governor-General it was an understood thing, and I think it was a very natural arrangement, that anything which could stand over until my noble friend's return should stand over, and one of those questions was obviously the partition of Bengal. It was a policy which did not at the time require immediate action, and the period of the noble Lord's absence was intended to be shorter than it actually became. Therefore, I have a very clear recollection that I left the question of the partition of Bengal severely alone. It was a policy for which I had no responsibility as regards the initiation, for the local governments were not taken into the confidence of the Viceroy in this matter when the policy was first devised.

So far as I can recollect—I am relying solely on memory—there was only a short *ad interim* reference to the local government during my time at Simla. It was suggested that the actual boundaries should be altered—extended on one side, so as to include districts which were homogeneous and in order to get a boundary clearly defined by a river, and, I think, contracted on another side. It was merely an adjustment of the whole scheme. That was referred, by way of routine, to the Government of Bengal, who agreed that it would be an improvement in every way. No action was decided upon, this *ad interim* reference being reserved for the decision of my noble friend when he returned to India. I believe the Papers are in the Blue-books which were presented to Parliament, so that I speak subject to correction. That is all I have to say on that subject. But as I am speaking, perhaps your Lordships will allow me to say a few further words which I venture to think will not be wholly inappropriate. I wish only to express my general agreement with the opinions and the policy of the Secretary of State. I think it is desirable, as has been suggested by more than one speaker, that people in India as well as people in this country should be made aware of the full measure of support which is given to the Government. I should like to say, first of all, that I am in entire accord with the diagnosis of the situation in India which has been made by the noble Viscount on more than one occasion. It is, I think, a matter of dark clouds obscuring the Indian skies rather the rumbling of an imminent earthquake. In other words, I think we stand upon firm ground, and that firm ground is the good sense and the good will of the vast majority of the people of India, whether they belong to the educated classes or to those classes who cannot reason or think upon these subjects. That being so, my Lords, we can guard ourselves against the dangers of a possible storm in a manner which would not be possible if the earth were about to swallow us up, or at least to bring to ruin most of that which we have built up. I believe firmly that the strong measures which have been undertaken by the Viceroy and the Secretary of State, and even stronger measures yet if they should be necessary, will be approved by that great majority in India.

A malignant growth has to be excised from the body politic of India, and, like many a canker, it has grown unobserved for a very long time when it ought to have been cauterised long ago. Small wonder, then, that the poison has found its way even to such remote parts of the system as the southern districts of Madras. Of course, there is distemper and ill-humour while the patient is so gravely affected, and we cannot wonder that there should be that estrangement and alienation between the rulers and ruled in India to which the Secretary of State has made allusion. But I believe that when the cause of the disease is removed, those symptoms will disappear as quickly as the petulance of a sick man disappears with returning health. What is needed besides the surgeon's knife are those influences which give confidence and hope to the patient—confidence in the skill, the firmness, and the knowledge of the operator, and the hope of return to all the joys of vigorous and growing life. I agree, therefore, that a policy of pure repression is out of the question, and I agree that side by side with the maintenance of order there must go the satisfaction of those reasonable aspirations which we have not only taught but also encouraged. I think that my noble friend the Secretary of State will recollect that when I had the privilege of corresponding with him for a short time on his first assumption of office, I did urge upon him that reforms in the direction which he himself has undertaken were not only necessary but also overdue, and therefore the noble Viscount will recognise that I am sincere in the support which now I accord to him.

I must not detain your Lordships longer at this hour. There is much else which I should have liked to have said in support of my noble friend, with one slight exception, if time had permitted. That only exception is this. I am not quite sure whether it would not have been wiser if the Press Act had been introduced at an earlier period. My noble friend said that the Explosives

Act ought to have been passed into law twenty years ago. I think that the Press Act might similarly have been passed into law twenty years ago. But certainly, so far as the present Government and administration of India are concerned, I am strongly of opinion—I cannot resist it—that that Act might have been introduced, and ought to have been introduced, twenty months ago. I believe that if that had been done we should have had fewer of the outrages that have occurred, we should have had an earlier expression of the confidence of those classes who desire the maintenance of our rule, and we should have had an earlier opportunity of dispelling the notion that the Government of this country were afraid. There is no doubt that that notion existed, and the proof is to be found in the news which reaches us daily through the medium of the Press. We see that since the passing of those two Acts—the Press Act and the Explosives Act—various important public bodies have been passing resolutions declaring their approval of the policy of the Government of India and their strong desire that order should be maintained. Well, my Lords, to conclude rapidly, I believe that my noble friend has discovered the germs of disease, and I only trust that the antitoxin which he has prepared will be sufficiently swift and certain in its action. I need hardly add that I regard with most cordial sympathy the calm and courageous attitude with which my noble friend has faced the immense difficulties with which he has had to deal.

LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: My Lords, I feel that great indulgence is needed in attempting to address your Lordships even for a few moments on this subject, as I have not the justification which can be advanced in support of everyone who has yet addressed you, of having been intimately associated with the Government of India. I am a complete outsider, but I venture to ask your attention for a minute or two, chiefly for this reason. It seems to me that there is considerable danger that language used by those who have entered into this discussion may be interpreted in two different ways. Your Lordships will remember that a late distinguished Member of this House said on a memorable occasion—

> "Mr. Gladstone and I may use the same language, but we do not mean the same thing."

My noble friend below me, the Secretary of State, speaking of the present situation in India, has used language which is sufficiently clear, and with which, I think, we are all ready to agree. He is firmly resolved to put down all disorder to use every weapon now in his hands for that purpose, and, if necessary, to adopt any further means that may be required to accomplish that object. He is also firmly resolved to persevere, and to persevere without delay—in that respect differing from the attitude of the noble Lord who initiated this discussion—in the programme of reform which he has sketched out. The action which my noble friend is taking is action for the repression of crime and incentives to crime. The noble Lord opposite has urged my noble friend to put down agitation. Criminal agitation, no doubt, my noble friend is prepared to put down; but I am quite sure he would not go any further. It is most undesirable, I think, that any impression should go forth from this House into the country, and still more into India, that it is his intention to do anything which shall limit or repress genuine political agitation. It may be that there is agitation in India for things which cannot be achieved, which are dreams of a distant future; but, as long as that agitation is confined within the limits of law and order, I am persuaded that my noble friend has no intention of repressing it. It is criminal agitation, and that alone, which he is resolved to curb.

In this connection I would refer to what has been said by more than one noble Lord with respect to education. The noble Lord who opened this debate and Lord Cromer referred to the system of education which we have given India as, perhaps, the primary cause of the political agitation which there prevails, and they suggested some change in the mode of education which should correct that evil in the future. That appears to me a very narrow view of the education we have given to India. That great system is bringing the educated Indian into contact with the ideas of the West.

The ideas of the West may be to the educated Bengali something like what the fire-water was to the Red Indian—it may lead him to extremes to his own destruction; but it is impossible that anything my noble friend can do will prevent the inter-communication of ideas between East and West, and it is vain to think of altering the scheme of education there so as to prevent that intercommunication.

The bringing of the educated Indian in contact with the ideas of the West has been going on through our mutual intercourse, through the literature which has gone from one country to the other, and when to that has been added the extraordinary spectacle of the Japanese contest with Russia it is not surprising that there should arise in the minds of the many educated Indians—relatively to the mass of the people extremely few—who direct the Press and have so large a share in the management of political agitation dreams of the possibility of an autonomous India. Those may be idle dreams—my view is that they are quite idle and that the attempt to put them into practical shape at once would be most ruinous to all that is orderly and well arranged in India itself; but I say you cannot hope to suppress them altogether. All you can do is to lead the people by the scheme of systematic reforms which my noble friend said he was bent upon pursuing, and in respect of which he quoted those noble words of Lord Minto which deserve to be carved in letters of gold. You must endeavour to meet the aspirations of the people by encouraging them to take part in the administration, in some degree, of their own affairs. It is necessary to emphasise this view.

Reference has been made several times to the partition of Bengal, and my noble friend the Secretary of State for India said of that partition that it was conceived by an unfortunate method, that it was prosecuted with a good deal of discussion; that it was proposed now in one form and now in another; and the outcome of his observations was that it was a matter upon the ordering of which there might be, as there had been, many opinions on the part of officials and others. But if it was conceived by an erroneous method, why did my noble friend as soon as he took office declare that it was a closed matter which could not be re-examined? I venture to think that that is carrying the notion of continuous policy in respect to India far beyond what is necessary, or, indeed, what is consistent with his own principles. If the change was administratively incorrect, even if it only did that which the noble Lord who introduced this discussion admitted—namely, run counter to the political aspirations of many of those who were interested in the division, it was good ground for re-examining the proposal. My noble friend says he will not now dream of re-opening it, and that it must be treated as for ever closed. I own myself that I regret the conclusion at which my noble friend has arrived, and which I think is not consistent with his general attitude. It seems to me not consistent also with the right line of policy in dealing with Indian discontent. I hold that the only method of grappling with the problem and the only hope of a peaceful and orderly issue is to meet continually what is reasonable, defensible, legitimate, and natural in the national feeling.

*Lord LAMINGTON: My Lords, at this late hour I will make my remarks very brief. I can only speak from my acquaintance with one portion of the Indian Empire—that on the Bombay side. It has been generally allowed that our system of higher education has been the cause of unrest. Yet I do not think anyone who is at all acquainted with India would deny that education was more advanced in the Bombay Presidency than in any other part of India; yet it is very noticeable that during all these disquieting times there have been no outrages there such as have characterised the agitation that has taken place in Bengal. I agree with my noble friend Lord Ampthill's estimate of the present disaffection. I think it is not deep-seated, and that it will pass away in due course.

I do not agree with Lord Curzon as to education striking deep down in India. I consider that education in all its effects is rather lateral, and influences people of their own caste rather than as in this country, where the pronouncement of any single great man or writer finds its way down through all classes of the people. There is a very numerous section of the educated class in Bombay who are absolutely loyal and devoted to our rule, and that is, I think, very largely owing to the nature of the education given in that Presidency. Far more advantage has been taken there of technical education than, perhaps, in other parts of India, and therefore we find the leaders of all branches of the community engaged in industrial enterprise and interested in the material development of the province. That, I believe, has been a great check and safeguard against disaffection taking the extreme form that it has taken in other parts of India.

Nobody would gainsay that the Brahmans, whose headquarters are at Poona, by a remembrance of their rule not a century ago and by their great intellectual power and capacity for framing a policy, are those who would be most likely to engage in constitutional reform, and they have done so, but upon lines of sense and with a certain regard to what is constitutional. If any further steps could be taken to keep agitation on constitutional lines, every attention should be paid to the development of primary education. It has been represented to me by several leaders in India that if we want to get the lower classes to understand the benefits of our rule and to become less susceptible to the wiles of the agitators, primary education should be increased. With regard to higher education, as Lord Curzon wisely said, students have been encouraged to take up higher education, but no regard has been paid to the development of their character. The result is that you have turned out these young men by the score without any sense of responsibility and without any knowledge of how to turn their education to the best advantage. I would suggest that, without in any degree limiting the facilities for higher education, it should be given to the public at its proper cost. Thereby you would not tend to check the education of those who really wished to take it up, but you would not give a fictitious encouragement; at the same time, you would bring home to the young men a certain sense of responsibility.

Lord Lamington.

One other remedy has been alluded to as meeting the present dissatisfaction—namely, the development of local self-government. The noble Viscount opposite indicated that through all the different spheres of administration he hoped something would be done in this direction. I believe that by encouraging a sense of responsibility among the different classes you will get a greater feeling of confidence and of interest in good government; but, at the same time, it must be remembered that even with existing local boards and municipalities, there are constant requests from those who live under their jurisdiction to have them removed as only a hindrance to the prosperity of the locality. Therefore it must not be expected that you are going to work wonders because you intend introducing an extended system of local self-government. Before I left Bombay we tried to encourage a system of decentralisation by allowing the Commissioners of various divisions to have wider and more extended powers, and not to be compelled to refer so constantly to headquarters. If you wish to en-encourage local self-government, it is essential that it must go *pari passu* with a certain amount of decentralisation, and you must not expect as high a standard of efficiency as in the past. The noble Vicount said we had rather sacrificed ourselves on the altar of efficiency; and it is so. We desire such a high standard of administration that we often run counter to the wishes and feelings of the people; and certainly it is a part of any enlarged system of local self-government that you should not require the same standard of efficiency and have the same amount of supervision of the district officials.

As regards the reforms that have been indicated in the Legislative Councils, I hope that these may soon bear fruit, for I agree with the noble Viscount that it would not do for the Government to be deterred from carrying out the reforms they think necessary by the agitation which is at present taking place. At the same time, I earnestly hope that there will be a more stringent Press law, for these concessions must be accompanied by an assurance that order must be respected, and that those who week by week and month by month have fomented wild ideas in the mind of the people will not be allowed to do so in the future. I quite agree that Press prosecutions are generally undesirable. The best way that I can see to meeting the difficulty is that every newspaper should give a guarantee of good conduct. That view has been put before the public from time to time; and I think there is a general feeling that a system which would be far less resented would be to insist upon either the licensing of newspapers or that every newspaper should give a guarantee for its proper management. As the noble Lord who initiated the discussion pointed out, what is really far more insidious and far more dangerous than incitement to murder is that week by week the mass of the people should be told that they are being ruined by our rule in India, that we are responsible for the introduction of plague and such other wild and mendacious statements. I regard those statements as far more serious because they do appeal to the greater number; and, therefore, whatever concessions are given, I earnestly hope the Secretary of State will consider the desirability of having a more stringent Press law, such as has been indicated by the Viceroy in the speech referred to this evening.

There is no analogy to the freedom of the Press in this country, because it must be remembered that the Government of India are always at a disadvantage. There are no party newspapers, and only one side is ever heard. Here you can rely upon the Press of one Party challenging the statements of the other, but that is not so in India. I will conclude by saying that the remarks of the noble Viscount the Secretary of State tonight will give full confidence in India to our officials who at the present time are engaged in a very difficult and delicate task, and to the law-abiding and loyal people who do not understand apparent indifference towards what is being done to attack our rule. They do not understand apathy, but construe it into fear; and, therefore, it is desirable that steps should be taken and words spoken which will be an exhortation to encourage those who are the bulk of the people and who are entirely faithful to the rule of our Government.

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: My Lords, I will not, at this extremely late hour and before a House of such small dimensions, attempt to answer the noble Viscount. I own that I do not recognise the picture that he gave in some parts of his speech either of the substance or the spirit of my argument; but I shall be quite content that he should judge me from the text of my speech when it appears in the newspapers to-morrow. There was much less difference of opinion between us than he appeared to infer; and, for my own part, it certainly was my desire to give the noble Viscount the warmest support, so far as I was entitled to speak with any authority, to the policy he has pursued, and is pursuing, in India.

With regard to subsequent incidents of the debate, I am very sorry that Viscount Midleton felt it incumbent on him to devote so large a portion of his remarks to me. I have always deeply regretted the causes of the difference between us, but, if he will allow me to say so, I will not, though I think there was much provocation, allow them to be enhanced by anything he has said this evening. I will only say this on the points at issue. The first point was rather a question of language than of fact. The noble Viscount was indignant with me because I said that the Ameer had dictated to us the terms of the treaty. The facts can be stated in four sentences. The Government here sent out a treaty which we were instructed to conclude; the Ameer proposed an entirely different draft; the Government of India was most reluctant to accept it; but the Government at home ordered the acceptance of the draft. That is the long and short of the whole thing.

With regard to the sentence in a telegram addressed by Viscount Midleton to myself, he was wrong in saying that I called those words the pivot of the agitation in India. My words were that the feelings excited in India had been enhanced by the inference drawn by the agitators from the terms of that telegram.

But the inference was widely, almost universally, drawn in India, as I think I could prove to the noble Lord from extracts from the newspapers. And undoubtedly the feelings thus excited were among the factors which produced unrest.

There is another small matter mentioned by some noble Lords on this side, and about which I am not certain that the memory of any of us is quite accurate. I speak of the partition of Bengal. I gave credit to Lord Ampthill for the particular form in which the partition was ultimately decided upon. I did so as an act of generosity which I thought was entirely deserved by the circumstances of the case. The noble Lord repudiates it. It fell to my lot to verify the facts only a few days ago in connection with another matter. When I left India in 1904 the partition had not taken definite shape, and in the hands of the noble Lord, who managed the affair with scrupulous regard to the Viceroy who was shortly to succeed him, changes were made in the proposals regarding Madras which I had made, certain of the proposals in regard to Bengal were knocked out because the Lieutenant-Governor did not like them, and the entire scheme as regards Bengal was remodelled and enlarged.

Viscount Midleton was right in saying that communications came from India and communications were made to me from the India Office while I was in this country; but being Viceroy temporarily *functus officio*, it was not my business to interfere, I left it in their hands; and when I went back to India and found the decision put before me, so satisfied was I with the discretion exercised that I sanctioned it and authorised a despatch to the Secretary of State. I apologise for making these few remarks of an explanatory character, but I think they have been called for. The only other point about which I would like to ask the Secretary of State is whether he can see his way to lay Papers as mentioned in my Motion.

VISCOUNT MORLEY OF BLACKBURN: I am not quite able to reply positively, but I do not doubt I shall be able to lay Papers.

*LORD CURZON OF KEDLESTON: I am in the hands of the noble Viscount. It is a matter within the discretion of the Government. We shall be glad to have Papers.

VISCOUNT MORLEY OF BLACKBURN: I will consider the matter, and certainly will be as liberal as I possibly can.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at five minutes past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 30th June, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time to-morrow.

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill; North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [Lords]; Upton Town Hall Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time; to be considered upon Thursday.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Select Committee:—1. "That in the case of the Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of 'Charles Haines' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

2. "That, in the case of the Ards and Bangor Railways Bill, Petition for Additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to insert the additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

3. "That, in the case of the Thames River Steamboat Service Act (1904) Amendment Bill [Lords], Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 128 in the case of the Petition of 'General Steam Navigation Company' against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

Resolutions agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill; Bromley and Crays Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to:—Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; King's College, London (Transfer) Bill [Lords]; Audenshaw Urban District Council Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from West Kilburn, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against: from Hammersmith and other places; and Leith; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour: from Radcliffe and Kersley; and Wollescote; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Bo'ness, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against: from Bradford Leigh and other places; and Wickham; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from West Kilburn, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour: from Bryncross; Coventry; Leith (two); Pontyrhyll, Wakefield; Wimbledon; and Wimbledon and Merton; to lie upon the Table.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Petition from Pontypridd, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Govan, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON ACT, 1898.

Paper [presented 22nd May] to be printed. [No. 201.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4049 and 4050 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN BOARD.

Copy presented, of Thirty-third Annual Report (for 1907–8), with Appendices [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 202.]

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES.

Copy presented, of Eighty-sixth Report of the Commissioners, dated 29th June, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 203.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Minute of the Board of Education, dated 30th June, 1908, modifying the Regulations applicable to Schools for Blind, Deaf, Defective, and Epileptic Children, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Assassination of an Indian Constable at Calcutta.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether any information can be given regarding the assassination of an Indian constable in Calcutta at the end of last month.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The Secretary of State has no official information on the subject. The only case of which he has any knowledge is that of a constable who, according to the report in the newspapers, died of a stab inflicted by a burglar whom he interrupted.

Restriction on Loans to Local Authorities.

SIR THOMAS ROE (Derby): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that it is the practice of the Public Works Loan Commissioners to refuse applications for loans from urban district councils whose districts have a rateable value exceeding £200,000, and also to limit the purposes for which loans are advanced to such councils; and whether he is prepared to advise the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury to relax the restrictions at the present time imposed by them in this respect.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George*). The loans of the Public Works Loan Commissioners are restricted, as my hon. friend describes, under direction of the Treasury. The object of the restrictions is to secure that loans out of the Local Loans Fund shall, as far as possible, be made available only to those local authorities which are least able to borrow on their own account in the open market, and only for those purposes which Parliament is believed to be specially desirous of encouraging. If the restrictions were removed, the effect, under present market conditions, might be that many loans of large amount would be applied for by the councils of districts of high rateable value, who are in a position to exercise their own credit; also loans for undertakings of a commercial or remunerative character, which the Local Loans Fund is not specially intended to assist. These loans could not be made except by further issues of local loans stock, depressing the price of that stock, and thereby necessitating the raising of the rates of interest for the poorer as well as for the richer borrowing authorities. So long as these conditions continue I am not prepared to relax the restrictions.

Evicted Tenants' Grievances.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution passed at the annual meeting of the Cork County Council, which set forth that in the opinion of that body the Evicted Tenants Act of last year was inadequate to settle this question; that the administration of the Act was unsatisfactory, and that the manner of deciding evicted tenants' claims without any provision for appeal in case of alleged injustice was most objectionable and unjust; and, seeing that there is considerable discontent amongst evicted tenants over the delay in procuring their reinstatement, will he say whether something will be done immediately to facilitate their re-settlement on the land.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) My attention has been called to a newspaper report containing the resolution referred to in the Question. It is too soon yet to judge of the effect which the Evicted Tenants Act of last year will have in settling the question. There is no foundation, so far as I am aware, for the suggestion that the administration of the Act is unsatisfactory. I understand that nearly 1,600 evicted tenants in all have been reinstated since the Act of 1903 was passed. The Estates Commissioners are proceeding with the matter as rapidly as possible.

Purchase of Holding for B. Radford, of Gurtienminogue.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have been in communication with Benjamin Radford, Gurtienminogue, with reference to his holding; did they offer to advance £315 to enable him to purchase his holding from Mrs. Richards, Gurtienminogue; and can he say why the sale has not been carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are unable to identify any proceedings before them in the case referred to.

Annuities Collectable under the Land Purchase Acts.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the amount of annuities collectable yearly in Ireland under the Purchase Act of 1885, under the Purchase Acts of 1891 and 1896, and under the Purchase Act of 1903, respectively; and what is the number of annuitants in arrear at date, and what is the amount in arrear under each of these Acts, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The required information, up to 1st July, 1907, is given in the Annual Report of the Irish Land Commission for 1906–1907 (Cd. 3652 of 1907, page 9, Payments of Purchasers' Instalments). Similar statistics up to 1st July, 1908 are in course of preparation, and the annual report containing them will shortly be laid before Parliament.

Consideration of Scottish Estimates.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Prime Minister if he will appoint another day for Scottish Estimates in order that the administration of the Congested Districts Board may be discussed, as well as the Fishery Board and Local Government Board (Scotland) Votes.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith*). As I stated yesterday, I am prepared to consider whether half a day can be given between now and the end of July for the discussion of Scottish Estimates.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve.

MR. GEORGE D. FABER (York): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the present system of supplying uniforms to the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve has completely broken down, and that, though repeated applications have been made, no kits have been issued to the Clyde division since March last, and that 190 men of that division are at present without kits, and consequently unable to appear on parade, or in church, or to embark in the Fleet for instructions; will he state whether uniforms are issued from the Deptford store; and whether the Deptford store at the present time has its usual amount of general stores in reserve; and, if not, what is the reason of the diminution.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The kits for the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve are supplied through H.M.S. "President," West India Docks. The made-up garments (jumpers, trousers, etc.) are made to measure by a contractor, and the other articles (caps, knives, etc.) are drawn from the Deptford Victualling Yard. The contractor who received the orders for the supply of uniform jumpers, trousers, etc., for the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve this year was re-arranging his premises at the time when the orders were received, and has, consequently, found some difficulty in coping with the large demands that were made upon him at the same time. The supply of the uniforms has since then been hastened, and it is expected that the balance to complete all orders will be despatched early next week. In regard to the articles supplied from Deptford, there is a shortage of sennet hats, the stocks of which have advisedly been kept low, owing to the present pattern having proved unsatisfactory and a new pattern being under trial. Supplies to the new pattern are, however, now becoming available.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there a shortage in any other articles in the stores at Deptford?

Mr. McKENNA: I am informed this is the only shortage, and it has been adequately explained.

Bomb Outrages at Calcutta.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the Government has any information regarding the recent discovery of a bomb on the steps of the Scottish Mission Church at Calcutta.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.): The Secretary of State received a report with regard to the finding of the bomb, but it gave no substantial information beyond that which was contained in the newspapers.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Has the hon. Gentleman any information showing that the outrage in this instance was due to a trade dispute?

Mr. BUCHANAN: We have no information to that effect.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can now give the House any information regarding the outrage perpetrated near Calcutta upon the Eastern Bengal State Railway.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The most recent report received from the Government of India informs us that the man, Campsie, the most severely injured, is progressing, and that as yet no clue has been obtained to the perpetrators of the outrage.

Government of India and the Franco-British Exhibition.

Mr. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can state the amount of the subsidy granted by the Government of India to the cost of the Indian section of the Franco-British Exhibition.

Mr. BUCHANAN: A grant of £10,000 has been made and a further sum of £5,000 has been guaranteed. The latter will be drawn upon only if there should be a deficit in the working of the section. The Committee hope to recover eventually a substantial part of any excess expenditure above £10,000.

Indian Exhibits in the Franco-British Exhibition.

Mr. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that there is dissatisfaction among Indian traders, merchants, and visitors at the inadequacy of the Indian section of the Franco-British Exhibition in showing the economic resources of the dependency and the development of Indian trade with Europe, most of the exhibits being specimens of Indian decorative arts and such as to constitute the section merely a bazaar; and, if so, whether in future exhibitions that may receive subsidies from the Government Exchequer he will make certain, by the appointment of Indian gentlemen on the committee, that the true resources of the Indian Empire are visualised.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State is informed by the committee responsible for the Indian section that, with the necessarily limited funds and space at their disposal, they have taken every possible step to invite exhibits from India, and to make known their readiness to assist exhibitors. The classified list of exhibitors and exhibits shows that with the resources at the command of the committee the collection is quite a fair one. The committee includes among its members two gentlemen, members of the Council of India.

Indian Press and the National Congress.

Mr. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware of the statements published in the *Eastern Bengal and Assam Era*, an Anglo-Indian journal published at Dacca, attributing the Goalundo and Mozufferpore outrages to the meetings of the Indian congresses, and advocating the arrest and flogging of the congress leaders; whether he is also aware that this journal also advocated the public flogging of Mr. G. B. Arundale, headmaster of the Hindu College at Benares, and those who sympathised with him, because he had presided at a meeting which closed with the cry of Bande Mataram; and, if so, will the clause of the Indian Penal Code dealing with writings that create hatred be applied to the *Eastern Bengal and Assam Era*, as to other journals recently suppressed under the terms of the Code.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has not seen the statements referred to. The provisions of the Penal Code apply in the same way to the paper mentioned as to all other publications, and would be enforced under the same conditions.

Debates on the Indian Press Act.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Report of the Debates which took place in the Indian Council upon the new Press Act.

MR. BUCHANAN: The supplement to the *Gazette* of India containing the Report of the debate will be supplied in the usual course to the Library of the House, and the hon. Member will perhaps consult it there. It is expected by next week's mail.

Mohmand Expedition Papers.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India when the promised White Paper dealing with the Mohmand punitive expedition will be issued to the House.

MR. BUCHANAN: The preparation of the Papers is being expedited; but I cannot yet name a day for their publication.

MR. MACKARNESS: Will the Paper be laid on the Table before the debate takes place?

MR. BUCHANAN: I hope so.

Dinizulu.

MR. NICHOLLS (Northamptonshire, N.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Stoke-on-Trent, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the constitution of the special Court appointed to try the chief Dinizulu; and why it has been thought necessary to establish a special Court under a special law for this trial.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): I cannot at present add anything to the reply returned to a similar Question on 24th June with regard to the constitution of the Court. Ministers have proposed the establishment of a special Court, because they think that by this means they will best secure a strictly impartial tribunal for this important trial. The Governor of Natal concurs in this view, as do also His Majesty's Government.

Hague Conference—Signature of the Convention.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the result of the careful consideration of the various conventions and instrument annexed to the final Act of the Hague Conference, promised before 30th June, has led to further instructions by His Majesty's Government as to signing all or a portion of them with or without reservations.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The British Plenipotentiaries, acting under instructions, proceeded to The Hague and signed yesterday the various instruments annexed to the final Act of the Hague Conference, with the exception of the Convention creating an International Prize Court, which remains open for signature for another year. Papers will shortly be laid showing what States have signed the various instruments, the period for signing which expires to-day, and the nature of the reservation made by this and other countries.

Insecurity at Salonika.

MR. G. GOOCH (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the failure of the Chief Commissary of Police at Salonika to maintain security in that city and to punish criminals, he will instruct the British Ambassador at Constantinople to urge his dismissal.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The state of insecurity which has recently prevailed at Salonika has not escaped the notice of His Majesty's Minister at Constantinople, who has drawn the attention of the Grand Vizier to the matter, and pointed out that the present Director of the Police is apparently not competent to discharge the duties efficiently.

*Mr. REES: Are the British Government in any way responsible for the management of the city of Salonika?

Sir EDWARD GREY: It is very desirable that order should be maintained there.

Egyptian Special Tribunal Decree.

Mr. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Egyptian Decree of 1895, which brought into existence the special tribunal which passed the Denshawai sentences in June, 1906, has been repealed; whether any steps have been taken to carry out the important modifications of that Decree recommended by Lord Cromer in July, 1906; and, if not, upon whose advice have those recommendations been ignored.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The Decree has not been repealed, but it does not of itself set up the special tribunal; that can only be done on the application of His Majesty's Consul-General, who has been instructed not to take this step without reference to His Majesty's Government. The special tribunal will not be again invoked till the modifications referred to have been made, and meanwhile we shall rely upon the ordinary tribunals.

Mr. MACKARNESS: Did not Lord Cromer recommend that Amendments should be made which would prevent any public executions or floggings in the future?

Sir EDWARD GREY: These could only take place if the special tribunal was set up, which will not be the case.

Mr. MACKARNESS: Does the Egyptian Government think it desirable to keep up a law of exceptional severity in the interest of the British Army of occupation and no one else?

Sir EDWARD GREY: That depends upon how the native tribunals do their work.

The Vatican and the Irish Universities Bill.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government has taken any steps, directly or indirectly, to ascertain the views of the Vatican, or those entitled to speak for it in this country, respecting the Irish Universities Bill now in Committee of the House; and if their approval has been secured for the measure.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The Answer to both Questions is in the negative.

Captain CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that unless the approval of the Vatican or its representatives in this country is received to this Bill not a single Roman Catholic will dare enter the University of Ireland?

[No Answer was returned.]

Franco-Canadian Convention.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can now lay upon the Table the correspondence between the Canadian and the Home Governments concerning the application of our most-favoured-nation treaties under the Franco-Canadian Convention.

Sir EDWARD GREY: No, Sir; at any rate, not at present. I will consult the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the subject at a later stage.

Persia.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any further information as to the state of affairs at Teheran and other parts of Persia.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I have little to add to the information already given to the House. The Shah has issued a proclamation dissolving the Mejliss, and summoning another three months hence. Meanwhile, Teheran and other towns have been placed under martial law. Some persons have taken refuge, according to the custom of the country, in His Majesty's Legation; and this, coupled with the fact that the Shah has posted troops in the neighbourhood of the Legation, an improper proceeding against which His Majesty's Government have protested, is giving rise to correspondence with the Persian Government, as the refugees cannot be given up without definite and reliable guarantees for proper treatment. I am informed that some refugees are in other Legations. There are reports of disturbances at Tabriz and other places in the provinces, but all accounts agree that there is not danger to foreigners.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: May I ask the date of the latest communication?

SIR EDWARD GREY: That brings it down to the telegrams I have received this morning.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): What would the Government consider definite and reliable guarantees for the safety of these refugees? Would they take the word of the Shah?

SIR EDWARD GREY: We are now considering what guarantees we shall ask for.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): Can the right hon. Gentleman answer the latter portion of the Question I put yesterday, and to which I received no reply?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot now ask yesterday's Question. He should put it down again if he wishes an Answer.

Imports of Arms into Muscat.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether a quarter of the whole imports into Muscat consists of arms; whether most of these are imported from Belgium; and whether the Brussels Conference has particular and precise instructions to deal with a traffic which directly promotes and prolongs warfare upon the north-west frontier of India.

SIR EDWARD GREY: During last year the import of arms, etc., into Muscat exceeded one quarter of the whole imports. About 50 per cent. of the amounts imported came from Belgium. The annual trade report of Muscat, which will be ready for publication shortly, will contain the statistics on the subject. The matter is engaging the attention of the Conference now sitting at Brussels.

*MR. REES: Has the right hon. Gentleman any information with regard to the presence of a body of Afghans at Regan who receive and distribute these arms?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot reply to that without notice

Swansea Dock Fatality.

MR. JOHN WARD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to an accident which occurred on Saturday, 20th June, at the King's Dock, Swansea, now in course of construction, by which a locomotive engine fell down an embankment and killed two men; whether it is intended to hold an inquiry into the cause and circumstances of such accident in accordance with the Notice of Accidents Act, 1894; and whether he can state the number of accidents, fatal and otherwise, reported as having occurred on these works since their commencement.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. There appears to be no power to direct a formal investigation in regard to this accident. As I pointed out to the hon. Member in reply to a previous Question with regard to this dock on 23rd March last, the application of the Notice of Accidents Act, 1894, to docks was repealed by the Factory Act of 1895. The accident also appears to be outside the provisions of the Factory Act with regard to the use of a dock or the construction of a building as contained in Sections 104 and 105. Provision to enable a formal investigation to be held in regard to accidents on works of construction will be made in the Bill which I propose to introduce this session. The number of accidents reported to the factory inspector by the contractors since the commencement of the work in May, 1904, is 586, of which eleven have been fatal.

Commonwealth Government and Irish Trade Mark.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is now in a position to state the decision of the Commonwealth of Australia in respect of the application that the Irish trade mark should be accepted as proof of origin of Irish goods, to which preference is given under the new tariff.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): The Australian Minister for Trade and Customs has, I understand, informed the Irish Industrial Development Association, in whose name the Irish trade mark is registered, that he considers that whilst the presence of the Irish trade mark would be valuable as additional evidence of origin, it would be found very desirable, in the interests of the movement for the protection and marking of goods of Irish manufacture, that his Department should also require the usual certificate of origin signed by the manufacturer or exporter.

Mall Improvement.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works what is the object or utility of the three parallel tunnels now in course of construction at the proposed entrance to the Park from Trafalgar Square; what is the length of each tunnel and the width; whether artificial light is proposed to be used in each tunnel; whether the centre tunnel is intended to be a reserved tunnel, and, if so, under what conditions; who is responsible for the design, and what style of architecture, if any, it is supposed to be; whether the buildings will eventually take the form of a semi-circus on each side; what is the estimated total cost of the buildings constituting the circus and the tunnels; what the buildings are proposed to be used for; and whether he would be willing to give reasonable notice to Parliament before undertaking any works of a similar type.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. L. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): The three arches through the new building at the end of the Mall are to convey the traffic from St. James's Park to Trafalgar Square. They vary in length from 37 to 50 feet, and the width of each is 20 feet. No artificial light will be used or required except at night. The centre arch is intended for State occasions. The design was made by Sir Aston Webb, R.A., under directions from the late Government. It was exhibited in the Tea-room of the House for several months before the work was begun, and the hon. Member had ample opportunities of objecting to any portions of it which offended his artistic taste. If there is such a word in the English language as "semi-circus," it does not accurately describe the form which the buildings will ultimately take. The cost of the buildings is provided partly by the Public Buildings Expenses Act of 1903 and partly from monies voted by Parliament after full discussion in this House. The total estimated cost is £180,000. The buildings will provide for an extension of the Admiralty and for residences for the First Lord and the First Sea Lord in lieu of those now occupied by them. It is not at present intended to undertake any other works of a similar type, but if any such were projected due notice would be given to Parliament as was done in relation to the present building, and no work would be commenced until Votes had passed the House of Commons.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: Does the right hon. Gentleman not think it would have been better to have allowed the public entrance to the park to be open instead of under a tunnel?

MR. L. HARCOURT: I am not inclined now to criticise the decision of my predecessors.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: When will it be fit for traffic?

MR. L. HARCOURT: I should think that some time next year we shall be able to admit traffic through.

Medical Attendance for Post Office Employees.

MR. WILES (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, having regard to recent cases brought under his notice in which certificates of duly qualified medical practitioners, stating reason for sick absence of postal employees, have not been accepted by the Department, he will state when he intends to put into operation the recommendations contained in Paragraph 40 of the Hobhouse Committee's Report that free medical attendance should be provided for postal employees who reside in districts outside the four-mile radius.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I hope to bring into force the recommendation of the Select Committee respecting free medical attendance at home for persons living outside the visiting area of their medical officer on 1st October next. It was not possible to bring this concession into force at the same time as the other concessions recommended by the Committee on account of the complicated nature of the arrangements, and the requisite notices to the medical men that were necessary for giving effect to it.

Post Office Savings Bank—Unclaimed Balances.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any separate record is kept of unclaimed balances standing to the credit of depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank, and, if not, will he explain why this is not done; whether the accounts are audited, and, if so, what difficulty arises in ascertaining the total; whether any, and, if so, what, steps are taken to make known to possible heirs the existence of these unclaimed balances; and whether he can state in what manner they are disposed of.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The experiment has been made from time to time of keeping a separate record of such Post Office Savings Bank accounts as appeared to have been abandoned by depositors; but practically every case in which the balance was worth considering had to be re-transferred to the active ledgers. The separate record is now restricted to accounts in which the balance due is less than £1. Many depositors leave their savings untouched for years; and as the Post Office Savings Bank was established in the year 1861 only, it would not be right to assume, from the absence of transactions in an account, that the depositor is dead. Every assistance is given to persons claiming to be the representatives of deceased depositors.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Can the right hon. Gentleman tell us how many of these accounts have been dormant for a period of ten years and upwards?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I do not think that would convey any information that would be of value for the reason given—namely, that in the case of the Savings Bank depositors' accounts are left for very many years without being touched.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: But surely there is a large number of accounts which have been dormant for ten years or upwards which have lapsed altogether?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: That is not our experience. We should not consider that they had necessarily lapsed.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Does the right hon. Gentleman not consider that he is setting a very bad example to the other bankers of this country when a Government Department refuses to supply to the House of Commons——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. That is a matter of opinion.

Remuneration of Sub-Postmasters—Commission on Bankers' Postal Orders.

MR. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the Post Office circular respecting the remuneration of sub-postmasters, which reduces the rate of commission on bankers' postal orders to half an unit instead of one unit, as recommended by the Select Committee; and, if so, what action he proposes to take.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: In the scheme submitted to and recommended by the Select Committee full details were not in all cases given as to the treatment of exceptional cases. The case of bankers' postal orders is one of these, and in regard to them the existing practice is merely being continued. The reason for assigning a reduced rate is that postal orders presented in batches by bankers and others are already sorted and accompanied by dockets and paid in one sum, and entail less labour than the standard postal order. The half rate does not apply to the first 5,000 orders presented in batches.

Telephone Dangers.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he has read the Report of Dr. Allan, the medical officer of health for the city of Westminster, relative to the liability of the users of telephones to contract tuberculosis; if he is now convinced of the danger to public health to which his attention has already been drawn; and whether he will insist upon the adoption of the system of flat mouth-pieces, such as obtains in France with no disadvantage to the public service.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have read the report of Dr. Allan, which was not communicated to the Post Office, but was published in the *Lancet*. Steps are taken for the regular cleansing of Post Office public telephones, and suggestions for improved methods of disinfection are under consideration. In 1905 a series of tests were made of call office telephones in London by the City Medical Officer of Health, with the result that no evidence of any danger of infection was found. The case specially referred to by Dr. Allan appears to be quite exceptional. It was one of six in which tests were applied, and in the other five cases no trace was found of dangerous germs. Many appliances for attachment to telephones, in order to prevent the danger of infection, have been examined in connection with the Post Office telephone system, but their use is open to many objections. Washing with disinfectants is, in the opinion of medical experts, including Dr. Allan, the most effective safeguard.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON: The right hon. Gentleman has not appreciated the point of my Question. I asked as to the flat mouth-piece, and as to its superiority over other mouth-pieces.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: We have considered that and other appliances, but have not come to the conclusion at which the hon. Gentleman appears to have arrived.

*Mr. REES: Is there any difficulty in using a flat box to which there is no mouth-piece?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The matter is under consideration, and any suggestion from any one with real knowledge on the matter will certainly receive careful consideration.

Employment of Half-Timers.

Mr. W. R. REA (Scarborough): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he can see his way to appoint a Committee to inquire into the question of the employment of half-timers.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): I propose to appoint an Interdepartmental Committee, of which my hon. friend the Parliamentary Secretary of the Board has consented to act as Chairman. The constitution of the Committee will be announced shortly.

Grants for Secondary Schools.

Lord BALCARRES, (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, under the Regulations for Secondary Schools, 1908–9, the Board of Education are empowered to pay grants in full for the school year 1908–9, irrespective of the payment, if any, made for the school year 1907–8 to a secondary school, in respect of which the Board is satisfied that the conditions laid down in Article 5, as to denominational religious instruction, or in Article 18 (*b*), as to the imposition of a conscience clause applicable to boarders may be waived, in view of the educational needs of the area; and, if so, whether it is the intention of the Board to make such payments of grants in full in respect of which it is shown that the conditions in question can with advantage to the educational requirements of the district be waived.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Under the Regulations for Secondary Schools, 1908, any waiver of the conditions attached to any higher scale of grant by the Regulation of 1907 can only be granted as regards the conditions set out in Articles 23 and 24, except in continuance of a waiver already granted under the Regulations of 1907. As is stated in Paragraph 3 of the Prefatory Memorandum to the Regulations of 1908, no such waiver has been granted as regards Article 5, and only one as regards Article 18 (*b*). The waiver provisions are in any case only applicable to schools which received grants, or were recognised as pupil teacher centres, for the year 1907–8.

LORD BALCARRES was understood to ask in how many cases the waiver was granted in 1907?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I cannot say without notice, but I will get the information for the noble Lord.

Small Holdings Act—Dorchester (Oxfordshire) Inquiry.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board are aware that at a recent inquiry held under the Act, at Dorchester, in Oxfordshire, only five out of twelve applicants were present, and that this was partly, at least, owing to the fact that the inquiry was held at a time when it was impossible for all the applicants to attend.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): The Board are informed by the clerk of the county council that no complaint as to the time or place of meeting was received, and no reasons for non-attendance were given except by one applicant. In the hope of suiting the convenience of those who did not attend, another meeting was arranged and due notice given to the absent applicants, but only the one who had written explaining his absence at the previous meeting attended.

*VISCOUNT VALENTIA (Oxford): Could this information not be obtained more readily from the clerk to the county council of the county, a division of which the hon. Member so ably represents, than through the Board of Agriculture?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: It is entirely at the option of the hon. Member to address the question either to the county council or myself.

MR. MORRELL: Is not the object in addressing the question to the Board to call public attention to the matter, and is not that desirable?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: It depends entirely on the circumstances of the case.

Small Holdings Act—Expenses.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board will repay out of the Small Holdings Account the salaries and expenses of any officers specially appointed by a county council, with the sanction of the Board, to assist in establishing and organising small holdings under the Act.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The repayment of expenses of county councils is expressly restricted under the Act to those incurred in proceedings in relation to the acquisition of land, and although the Board are prepared to take as liberal a view of the terms of the Act as is at all possible, they have no power to sanction the repayment of expenses incurred for other purposes.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): Is the House to understand that all these expenses and salaries will be charged as additional rent on the tenant holders?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I do not understand that Question. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will give notice of it.

MR. MORRELL: The hon. Baronet told the House on 11th June——

*MR. SPEAKER: Quotations from speeches in this House are not now permissible.

MR. MONTAGU (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton): If the expenses of salaries are not borne by the Board of Agriculture, by what fund will they be borne?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said a certain part of the salaries might be payable for certain specific work done, but only the salary paid to an agent for the management of the land under the control of the county council would naturally form part of the expenses. As on any other estate, it would be part of the expenses of the estate and naturally would have to come out of the rents.

MR. MORRELL: If the whole of the time of the officer hitherto has been taken up in ascertaining the demand, and not in the managing of the estate, will the Board of Agriculture consider the advisability of repaying the salary during that time to the county council?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Those are preliminary inquiries, and the expense of preliminary inquiries cannot be repaid.

MR. MONTAGU: Will the cost of the preliminary inquiries fall on the rates of the county or on the small holders?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: That is a legal question, but I believe they would fall upon the general rates.

Small Holdings Act—Bishop's Lydeard Inquiry.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture whether his attention has been called to the fact that, at an inquiry under the Small Holdings Act held at Bishop's Lydeard, in Somerset, by the Somerset County Council, on Wednesday, 10th June, the chairman of the committee said that they had had the advice of the Board of Agriculture not to be in any particular haste to put the Act into operation, because it required very careful consideration; and whether the chairman had any authority for making such a statement.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board are informed that the chairman of the committee in question, in using the words to which my hon. friend refers, wished to emphasise the fact that care must be taken in putting the Act into operation and not in any way to encourage delay. Indeed he expressly stated that the council were desirous of carrying through the necessary inquiries at the earliest possible date. The reference to "the advice of the Board of Agriculture" was to our circular letter of 1st January last, a copy of which is doubtless in the possession of my hon. friend.

Small Holdings Act—Hours for Holding Inquiries.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, if it can be shown that the interests of any applicants have, in fact, been prejudiced owing to the hour at which an inquiry has been held, the Board will require another inquiry to be held; and whether, in the event of the committee finding it inconvenient to hold inquiries at hours suitable to the applicants, they will direct the Commissioners, in the exercise of the powers conferred on them by the Act, to ascertain for themselves the extent of the demand.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: If there is any reason to think the interests of applicants for small holdings have been prejudiced by the hour at which inquiries have been held the Board will ask the county council concerned to afford the men other opportunities for an interview. These inquiries are held for the purpose of ascertaining the suitability of applicants, and there does not appear to be at present any necessity for the Commissioners to hold meetings in order to ascertain the extent of the demand.

MR. MORRELL: As it is the primary duty of the Commissioners to ascertain what the demand is, will the Department consider the advisability of repaying expenses incurred by county councils when they are left to do the work?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: That is a statement that the Commissioners do not do the work they ought to do, and I differ from it entirely.

MR. MACKARNESS asked if the Board of Agriculture had any information showing how many councils hold the inquiries in the evening so that labourers can attend.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY asked for notice of that Question.

MR. MORRELL: Have the Commissioners ever visited the County of Oxford?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes, Sir, certainly.

Somerset County Council—Small Holdings Committee.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that at a meeting held by the small holdings committee of the Somerset County Council, the chairman of that council said that, if compulsory powers are resorted to, the cost of the exercise of such powers will increase the expense of acquiring the land, and thereby increase the rent of the land; whether it is a fact that the Board will repay to county councils all legal expenses and surveyors' fees in connection with the acquisition of land, and whether this applies equally whether the purchase is made compulsorily or by agreement; and, if so, whether he will circularise the councils accordingly.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board are informed by the clerk of the Somerset County Council that their chairman stated that the cost of the exercise of compulsory powers would fall on the small-holders, subject to any repayment made by the Board. The reasonable costs of compulsory purchase as in the case of purchase by agreement will be repaid by the Board and need not therefore increase the rent. A circular letter to this affect has been issued to county councils.

Grants to Sea Fisheries Committees.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he will state why, notwithstanding repeated promises that their claims would be considered, no provision whatever has been made for a grant to the local sea fisheries committees in whose hands the administration of the Sea Fisheries Regulation Acts is placed by law; and can he promise that an early consideration will be given to their claims.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to refer him to my reply on the 23rd instance, to a Question on the same subject by my hon. friend the Member for South-East Lancashire.

The Beef Trust and Deptford Cattle Market.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that on 17th and 24th June, when no markets were held at the Deptford Cattle Market, there were present in the lairages of that market 1,200 and 1,400 head, respectively, of cattle from the United States and Canada, the property of, or controlled by, the American Beef Trust firms, and that, although there were many English buyers present, the cattle were not offered for sale; whether he is aware that these cattle have since been slaughtered and put into cold storage by and for the trust, to be placed upon the market at prices at present entirely under their own control and regulation; and whether, in the public interest, the Board will institute some inquiry into the question of the meat supply of this country.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board are aware that there were a certain number of cattle in the lairages on the dates mentioned and that they were subsequently slaughtered, but they do not know what was the ultimate destination of the carcases. They were not retained in cold storage at Deptford Wharf. The Board do not think that any advantage would be gained by the institution of the inquiry proposed.

MR. BOWERMAN: Is it not the case that the withholding of cattle from sale under these circumstances was a breach of the regulations governing the Deptford Market? Can the hon. Baronet give the House any substantial reason for the refusal of the Board of Agriculture to institute any inquiry, especially having regard to the serious rise in price of meat in London?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I cannot answer the first Question. I must ask for notice of it. As regards the advisability of having an inquiry into the Meat Trust, it is on all fours with the desirability of inquiring into all trusts which are likely to raise the price of food and other commodities. I rather think the question is under the serious consideration of the President of the Board of Trade.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Will the hon. Gentleman not consider on behalf of the Government the desirability of appointing a Select Committee to inquire into this very serious matter?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: That Question should be addressed to the Prime Minister.

Bolingbroke Hospital.

SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether at the time the Charity Commissioners gave their sanction to the payment by the trustees of the Weir Charity of the sum of £5,000 out of the trust fund to the governors of the Bolingbroke Hospital, the proposed scheme under which the payment was purported to be made had been published by the Commissioners as required by Section 6 of The Charitable Trusts Act, 1860, in order that persons interested might have the opportunity given to them by that section of objecting to the scheme; and whether he will state under what statute, and under what section thereof, the Commissioners have, or claim to have, power to authorise payment under a prospective scheme before the proposed scheme has been published and definitely settled in accordance with the provisions of the abovementioned Act.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): The proposed scheme in the matter of the Weir Charity has been drafted and will very shortly be ready for publication. It will be published so as to ensure full opportunity to all persons interested of making objections or suggestions, and any such objections or suggestions will be carefully considered. The circumstances in which the Charity Commissioners sanctioned the payment in question were explained in the Answer given by me to a Question by the hon. Member on the 23rd March last.

SIR HENRY KIMBER pressed for an Answer to the last part of the Question.

MR. TREVELYAN said he thought his Answer sufficiently covered the point; otherwise, it would be necessary to give the details of a large number of sections.

Cost of Irish Administration.

CAPTAIN J. CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will state the amount of the increased cost of administration to the Treasury and the counties affected respectively, consequent on cattle-driving, outrages in which firearms have been used, boycotting, and other forms of intimidation in Ireland since the present Government was returned to office.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Royal Irish Constabulary was increased last autumn by 400 men, and is now being further increased by 350 men, with the object mainly of dealing with cattle-driving. The cost of these additional men will be approximately £47,000 per annum, of which a moiety will fall upon the counties concerned. There will be further charges for travelling, conveyance of prisoners, and such matters, some of which will be borne by the Constabulary Vote, and some will fall upon the counties. It is not possible to apportion the charges between the different classes of offences.

CAPTAIN J. CRAIG: When will there be an opportunity of discussing in this House these extraordinary charges?

MR. BIRRELL: On a day allotted to Irish Estimates.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is kept informed of the number of outrages in which firearms are used, the extent to which cattle-driving is being carried on, the spread of boycotting and other forms of intimidation in Ireland, as well as the judicial comments on the existing state of affairs made from time to time by His Majesty's Judges; and will he state how long the Government intend to permit such lawlessness to continue before taking adequate steps to uphold the law and afford due protection to the lives and property of the loyal, peaceful, and industrious minority in Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Before the right hon. Gentleman answers that Question, may I ask him whether he has any reason beyond their own assertion to believe that this minority is loyal; whether he is aware that on the disestablishment of the Irish Church they threatened to kick the late Queen's Crown into the Boyne, and whether the hon. Member himself did not threaten to raise a bloody war if the Government continued a particular course, and does he think that it is correct to describe this minority as a peaceful one?

CAPTAIN CRAIG: May I explain I never used such an expression? I said that if the Government pursued the course they were at that time taking, a bloody war would follow, and I am sorry to say it has proved only too true.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): In answer to the Question on the Paper, the Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. If by the latter part of the Question the hon. and gallant Member means to inquire whether the Government intend to put the Criminal Law and Procedure Act into force, the reply is in the negative. The Government have taken, and will continue to take, all possible measures within the ordinary law for the preservation of the peace, the punishment of offenders, and the protection of the persons and property of all classes of his Majesty's subjects.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Have the proceedings taken under the ordinary law proved to be adequate?

[No Answer was returned.]

CAPTAIN CRAIG: How long do the Government intend to go as they are doing?

MR. ASQUITH: That depends to some extent on the length of time the Government holds office.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Are we to gather from that that during the tenure of office of the present Government they will take no further steps to put down lawlessness in Ireland?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Universities Bill.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is the Government's intention to proceed further with the Irish Universities Bill under the circumstances that in Committee an Amendment has been introduced by which public money may be expended in supplying sites for churches and chapels within the walls of the new Universities, in contradiction of the pledge given on behalf of the Government that none of the money voted by Parliament would go to donominational purposes.

MR. BIRRELL: It is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Irish Universities Bill, and when the Report stage is reached the hon. and gallant Member will have full opportunity of discussing the point to which he refers.

Cork Corporation Surcharges.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board has issued a sealed order surcharging Members of the Cork Corporation for the cost of cabling the condolences of the Lord Mayor and Corporation of Cork to the Mayor of San Francisco on the destruction of the greater part of the latter city by earthquake; and whether, as head of the Local Government Board, he will take steps to prevent any such further breach of international courtesy and interference with the rights of Irish municipalities.

MR. BIRRELL: The answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. Local authorities are prohibited by statute from defraying any such expenditure out of the rates, and the Local Government Board are obliged to see that the law is carried out.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Is there any such thing known in an English municipality?

MR. BIRRELL: I imagine it would be.

MR. MOONEY (Newry): Has it not been the practice of the English Local Government Board to insist on the inclusion of a clause in every private Bill going into this House giving this power to municipalities?

MR. BIRRELL: I am not aware of it.

Mr. Griffith's Ballintogher Estate.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in July of last year, as the result of an arrangement come to in Judge Ross's Court, the estate of Mr. J. Griffith, situate near Ballintogher, county of Sligo, was inspected by an official of the Estates Commissioners, with the view of having the property purchased for the tenants; and, if so, what steps, if any, have since been taken to bring about the completion of this bargain.

MR. BIRRELL: The estate in question is for sale in the Land Judge's Court. The Estates Commissioners have had it inspected and are at present considering their inspectors' reports with a view to making an offer for purchase.

Irish University Bill.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government intend to submit the Irish Universities Bill to a National Convention in Ireland, as was done in the case of the Irish Councils Bill; and, if so, for what date will the Convention be summoned.

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Then how does the right hon. Gentleman know the Bill will be acceptable to the Irish people?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Because it is opposed by the hon. Member himself.

Commission on Irish Bank Notes.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware of the custom pursued by the Bank of England, and of other banks in London, to charge commission on the exchange of Bank of Ireland, National Bank, or other Irish bank notes; is he aware that this practice has been extended to Irish banks doing business in London on the exchange of their own notes for cash; and whether he will state if this custom is the result of a Bank of England regulation or an inter-bank arrangement, or, if not, upon what statute law it is founded.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The holder of such a note is not entitled to claim payment in Great Britain. If a London bank obliges him by cashing a note, I understand that it usually makes a charge of 1d. to 2d. for doing so. I am not aware of any statutory enactment either authorising or prohibiting such a charge.

Mr. FLYNN: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that this is a charge of 1d. in the £, and does he know that banks in London are debarred from negotiating these notes although willing to do so?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I am not aware of any statutory Act either authorising or prohibiting such a charge.

Mr. FLYNN: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the bank say they are debarred from doing so by the action of the Bank of England?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: So far as I am aware it is not a fact that the Bank of England interferes in the matter at all. They make what charge they like. There is no statutory power one way or the other.

Tied Trades.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware of the system under which wholesale millers, tobacconists, provision merchants, and others are in the habit of establishing numbers of tied houses where the tenants are compelled to carry on their business in accordance with the conditions laid down by such wholesale firms; and whether he will consider the desirableness of introducing legislation to deal with the matter.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am not aware to what extent the state of things described in the Question actually prevails, and I see no necessity for any legislation on the subject.

Government Contracts and the Fair Wages Clause.

Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the firm of Messrs. Vickers, Sons, and Maxim, Limited, of Barrow-in-Furness, is on the list of Government contractors; if so, whether he is aware that the firm have a clause in the indentures of their apprentices prohibiting their apprentices joining a trade society during the apprenticeship term; and whether the Government will make representations to the firm with a view to the withdrawal of the prohibition.

Mr. ASQUITH: The firm are on the list of contractors to the War Office. I am not aware of the existence of the clause in the indentures referred to; and the matter is not one in which I should feel entitled to intervene.

Income-Tax.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether income-tax is at present charged upon fines and premiums demanded by ground landlords upon the expiration of leases as a condition of their renewal.

Mr. ASQUITH: Income-tax is assessed on fines which fall within the charge imposed by the 5th Rule of No. II., Schedule A., Income-Tax Act, 1842. A premium charged on granting an ordinary lease for years, which carries with it no right to the renewal of the lease, is not treated as a fine within the meaning of the Rule.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY: Then the Answer means that when a landlord inflicts a heavy fine for the renewal of a lease he pays no income-tax on it?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: That depends on the position dealt with in the last part of my Answer.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Access to Mountains Bill): Mr. William Jones; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. King.

Report to lie upon the Table.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 204.]

Bill, as amended, re-committed, to a Committee of the whole House for to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 287.]

NEW BILL.

BAIL BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to release on Bail," presented by Mr. Secretary Gladstone; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 288.]

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 4:

*MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) moved to insert "net" before "income" in subsection (*a*). He desired to make it clear that only the available net income should be taken into account. The Amendment was intended to cover cases where people paid into clubs. As everybody knew, the working men in the country paid their pence in subscriptions to coal clubs, medicine and doctors' clubs, boot and shoe and clothing clubs, co-operative clubs, and so forth; and these subscriptions enabled them to obtain necessaries cheaply. Such payments reduced their incomes, and ought, therefore, to be deducted. No doubt the deductions would only be in pence; but then, the sliding scale of a pension also went down to pence; let them be fair to the thrifty.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 6, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'net.'"—(*Mr. Smeaton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'net' be there inserted."

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. L. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale) said the Government could accept the insertion of the word proposed. It was certainly the intention of the Bill that the yearly value of a man's income should be taken into account, and that it should not include any outgoings. The word "net" as applied to profits had a meaning which was fairly well understood, but as applied to income it would seem to require some definition. It was quite clear that rent and cost of living were not to be deducted from income for the purpose of the Bill, and to insert the word "net" without any explanatory phrase or word would certainly not do. The intention of the Bill was clear, and they could not accept that word, which might give rise to an interpretation dangerous to the whole clause.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said he was sorry the Government would not agree to the Amendment. It was quite clear in reading over the whole of Clause 4 that it would be very difficult to ascertain what a man's means really were within the meaning of the clause. He would give a case in illustration. Supposing an old man or an old woman subscribed to the Post Office for a small sum to be paid at death. Was that to be deducted, or not? He took it that the proposer of the Amendment assumed that income meant the available net income that the elderly person was really going to receive and could spend, whereas by the clause as it stood, there were no limitations and no definition, and there was nothing to show that small outgoings such as he had suggested would be allowed to be deducted so that the net amount might be ascertained. It was obvious that if they had two or three people whose means hovered about the limit, and who had some little outgoing, those expenses would be included, unless Parliament made it clear by putting in the word "net," that such outgoings were not to be calculated in the income. He was in hopes when he saw the Amendment that the Government would accept such a simple way of doing ordinary justice, and he very much regretted, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman had not accepted it.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E) said he did not quite follow the objection which the Government had to the Amendment. Supposing a person was left the benefit of a small property, and received the income from that property, but was bound to pay out of that income some small sum to another person, what would his income be taken as under the clause as it stood?

The net income would mean merely what they received for themselves after allowing for deductions, but was it quite certain that the word "income" by itself would mean the net income, and not the gross income? He was not certain whether there was not a technical meaning attached to the word "income" in law in connection with the Income-Tax Act, and if there was, and if the definition under the Income-Tax Act could be applied under the Bill, considerable injustice might be done, because the income for the purposes of income-tax included in certain cases money which the person clearly had not got to spend, *i.e.*, it was rather the gross income of a business before making certain deductions which the business involved, than the net income available to be spent by the proprietor.

Mr. L. HARCOURT said it was the intention of the Government and of the Bill that only clear income or clear annual value should be treated under this section, and he was advised that that would be the effect of the words as they stood. Although the word "net" as applied to profits had a definite meaning, it had no such definite meaning as applied to the word "income," and it might give rise to the suggestion that from the income should be deducted the cost of living, etc., and the Government regarded the word as too dangerous and too wide to insert in this case.

***Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD** (Leicester) asked what was the meaning of a "clear" income. Take the case of a middle class man who had insured his life; he deducted his insurance money for the purposes of the income-tax. Supposing those old persons who came under this clause were insured for their funeral expenses, which was really a form of life insurance, would the premiums they had paid for that benefit be regarded as part of a clear income or be excluded?

Mr. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) said that in the case of house property of a rather common class, large deductions were generally made for unlets, for the collection of rents, and for such outgoings as repairs, etc. Would the term "income" be the income after those charges had been satisfied or not? He would certainly have thought the income would be the gross rental receivable from those cottages, and that the landlord would not be entitled to deduct the expenditure necessary to command that rent.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon) said he could not give an answer to a very complicated conundrum of that kind, nor did he think it was altogether a question for the Law Officers. It was more a question for the Inland Revenue, who had been interpreting these things in the past. With regard to insurance, he would say the Inland Revenue would deduct any payment made in respect of that insurance. There was a very elaborate set of regulations which had accumulated for years, and he would be sorry to answer the point of the right hon. Gentleman straight off. He would not like to commit himself, but he did not think the case would be likely to arise under this Act, which would not take in men who had property of that kind. They might, of course, get a man who owned a cottage, and he did not know what the regulations of the Inland Revenue provided in a case of that sort, but he should think they would follow the general principles adopted in the case of income-tax, with this exception, that it was likely they might give a more liberal interpretation under this Act.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN thought the answer of the right hon. Gentleman showed that they were on rather a delicate point, and one requiring more serious consideration than had been given to it. Clearly the Government had not considered it, because the right hon. Gentleman was not prepared to answer, and said the Law Officers could not be expected to answer, and, therefore, he presumed they had not gone into it. What was the answer as far as the right hon. Gentleman had been able to give it? As regarded insurance, he thought the Inland Revenue would interpret anything in the nature of insurance as being entitled to an exception, following the principles adopted in regard to income-tax, and that the Inland Revenue might, in fact, go a little farther in these matters than they would under the Income-Tax Act. But the Inland Revenue had nothing whatever to do with the administration of his Act. The Excise officer was, the Prime Minister interrupted, an officer of the Inland Revenue, but that was really a correction of his statement of the flimsiest character, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister had announced his intention to transfer the whole of the Excise officers to the Customs. The Customs was not the Board of Inland Revenue, and as a matter of fact the Excise officer in this case was not put forward as an official who was to act under directions from either the Board of Customs or the Inland Revenue; he had to act to the best of his knowledge and judgment in consultation with or in correction of the local pension committee, and if they differed, the determination of the dispute rested with the President of the Local Government Board. Accordingly the Board of Inland Revenue had nothing to do with the matter, and the Board's precedents in connection with the income-tax could hardly be said to be binding on the Local Government Board. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the precedents in connection with the abatements allowed from income-tax in respect of the premium paid on an insurance policy would be followed. That was a statutory abatement, and the Inland Revenue only allowed it because there was a statutory provision to that effect, and the very fact that they only allowed it because of that would, he thought, be their justification for saying that where there was no statutory provision clearly Parliament did not intend them to do it. Under those circumstances he hoped the Government would reconsider the matter, for he thought it was clear that the word "income" by itself would not do. He would ask the Law Officer, who had now happily arrived, to assist them to find a suitable word.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) did not think there was any necessity for the assistance of the Law Officers. It was not a technical matter, and anyone acquainted with income-tax legislation, as he was, knew that the word "income" was rarely used in the Act. For that reason he thought there was a great advantage in putting it in this section, because it was not fettered by technical interpretations or legal associations. He understood by income what a pension committee or the Excise officer would say was, as a matter of common sense, the clear income of the person in question, and if they put in "net" he thought it would be a great mistake. Although he thought that, as a rule, the Excise officer would consider he ought to follow the spirit of the deduction allowed under the Income Tax Acts, it was much better in the interests of all concerned that they should not put in a hard and fast definition to prevent an elastic interpretation of the clause. In the case of cottage property, it was clear they could not regard the man's gross receipts as being his income, and the case of insurance premiums had been expressly provided for by statute in regard to income-tax, and he thought a pension committee would form the same opinion about it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he did not know whether leaving things to the common sense of the committees was the best way to avoid litigation, and the speech just delivered showed the extreme need of some guiding words. They had before them two illustrations of the difficulties that might ensue from the use of the word "income" only. Speaking as a man totally ignorant of the technicalities of the law, it seemed to him quite possible that if he were on one of these pension committes he should, from a common sense point of view, say the income from the cottages would be what was commonly called the net income, *i.e.*, the gross income less the necessary outgoings, and in that he agreed with the Prime Minister. But he was not so clear about the insurance matter. He had the utmost sympathy with those who insured their lives in order to provide for a cost which might occur after death, or for their successors in any form, but unless they put in statutory words and said that the ordinary income-tax regulation

Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

was to apply in this case, he asked the Committee whether they thought a man's income was to be exclusive of what he paid for insurance purposes. He thought common sense led them to the opposite view. Very likely old people would save what they could and put it by rather than insure directly with an office, but the House was not going to deduct such savings. What they put by themselves for expenses which would occur after death, the House did not deduct from their income. If, however, the money went into a society, they did deduct it. He did not think common sense made it clear that a proper distinction was to be drawn between these two cases. The Prime Minister prided himself on the fact that this phrase was not legal English, but common-sense English, which he properly distinguished from legal English, and they were dealing with common sense persons who were to distribute the fund. But let them compare that argument with the argument of the First Commissioner of Works. He said "net income" might lead the ordinary person to indicate a clear income, but it was a legal term which might be misinterpreted. He would have thought not, but he would accept the criticism of the right hon. Gentleman and make a suggestion. The First Commissioner of Works, appealing to a common-sense audience, talked about a "clear" income. Then let that be put into the clause and it would hit off the commonsense of the committees who would have to deal with the matter. If "net" income was a legal definition, and they did not want to deal with the legal aspect, then let the commonsense word suggested by a commonsense Minister to a commonsense House of Commons express the meaning of the Government.

MR. ASQUITH said the insertion of that word would not in the least assist the solution of the problem; the committees would still have to construe it according to their own ideas.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked whether it was not necessary to put in some words in order to solve this problem. His right hon. friend had spoken of the insurance which many might be expected to make in the way of life assurance. He thought it was as stated by the hon. Member for Leicester, but he was not certain. They were clearly likely to make insurance against sickness. They were far more likely to pay so much a week to insure against sickness, which was a far more pressing anxiety. He presumed that that would not be excluded from their means. With all respect to the Prime Minister, he adhered to his view with regard to what would be the effect of the Bill where there was no experience of these matters. The income-tax basis did not provide for any deductions for payments made to provide against sickness and for medical relief. Did the right hon. Gentleman suggest that the money he paid for doctors' bills was no part of his income?

MR. ASQUITH said the income-tax did not regard insurance premiums as income.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the hon. Gentleman who introduced the income-tax into the discussion said that the Excise officers would follow the precedent of the Income-Tax Act. His first observation upon that was that they would only follow it so far as the powers of this Bill corresponded with the powers of the Income-Tax Act, and this Act did not allow them to grant exemptions for payments made for life insurance. He suggested that some words should be put in to carry out the obvious intention of the Government in the matter.

*MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) asked for further information as to how income was to be arrived at. In the case of insurance premiums they were according to the Prime Minister to be allowed to be deducted as under the Income-Tax Acts, but the income of cottage property was not to be the sum at which it was assessed to income-tax, but the rental after deducting all cost of repairs, as it was known that the cost of repairs was in excess of the sum allowed in income-tax assessments. There was also another class to be dealt with. How was the amount of income of persons in occupation of land to be arrived at. More than 80 per cent. of the farmers in his constituency held less than 50 acres or paid less than

£50 rent. On the basis of the income-tax their profits were deemed to be one-third of their rent. Was that the basis upon which the pension officer was to go? Was the profit of a farmer paying £50 a year to be put down as £16 13s. 4d.? If so, neither he nor the farmers would object. At the present moment, however, so far as he understood the law as elucidated by the Prime Minister, one basis was to be adopted for arriving at the income of a person with cottage property, and another for arriving at the income of a tenant farmer. In dealing with such a complicated matter which was likely to lead to litigation and injustice, there should be precision of definition. He did not at present see how the income was to be arrived at.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): said the income of a tenant farmer was arrived at by taking a proportion of his rent.

MR. ELLIS DAVIES said the income of a tenant farmer is deemed to be one-third of his rental.

SIR F. BANBURY said that in the case of nine out of ten tenant farmers it would be nothing like that, but the person who was eligible for a pension was liable to be assessed on that basis. He contended that it would cause considerable hardship, because a great many people would be deemed to have an income they did not possess. If the word "net" was put in, it would certainly not include provision made for sickness or burial, nor would it include the payments suggested by the hon. Member for Leicester. If provision was to be made for that there must be a separate Amendment to deal with it. The only question for the Committee to consider at present was whether the word "net" should be inserted in this way. "Net" was a plain, simple, business word which every business man understood. "Net amount" meant the actual amount put into the pocket after all charges had been met, and available for spending. Its introduction would be a guide to the pension committee, and would not fetter them. He supported, therefore, the suggestion that it should be put in, although it was not a legal word, in order to make the matter clear.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University), as one who had had some experience in administering Acts of Parliament, did not think the insertion of either "net" or "clear" would strengthen the clause, without adding of what the amount was net or clear—of medical attendance, of repairs of cottages and so on. He did not see how the income-tax argument had any bearing upon the Bill. The income-tax set up an artificial income and laid down specifically what should or should not be taxed. If the Excise officer in administering the Bill was to work out a system, that was saying that he and not Parliament was to legislate. Committees might take most divergent views. One might exclude one set of payments, and another, another. It was Parliament that decided what should be included in deductions from income for taxing purposes. Even if that was not true, they could only deduct up to a sixth of the income. It was a purely artificial matter, and the whole question of profits under the Income-Tax Act was strictly regulated by Parliament. His own view was that they should leave the Bill as it stood. They would have Excise officers in the different districts setting up different standards of income and deductions, and in the end they would probably have to come back to the Local Government Board, the President of which would ultimately become the legislator in regard to the matter. The net conclusion of the whole argument came to this, that by leaving the word "income" as it was, without either the word "net" or the word "clear," they did not know what they were voting for.

MR. ASQUITH said that he agreed with every word that had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman. He did not wish it to be supposed that he had said or suggested that in determining what was income, either the pension committee, the excise officers, or ultimately the Local Government Board should feel themselves bound to determine the matter by the artificial provisions of the Income Tax Act. The only reason he had referred to it was to show that the problem under the Act was to ascertain that part of a man's profits which was really income; that was, the absolute profit, after all deductions which the Income-Tax Act allowed from profits had been made for the purpose of ascertaining that which, from the point of view of the State, should be regarded as income and assessable under the Income-Tax Act. That was the problem presented by the Income-Tax Act, and he referred to that, not as laying down a rule, but as showing a useful precedent. He quite agreed that it would be better that the word "income" should appear simply without an epithet prefixed. As the right hon. Gentleman had said, the only way of really working the thing out would be, not to prefix a vague epithet like "clear" or "net," but to have a schedule allowing statutable deductions. But however carefully that schedule was drawn they would find that they had omitted something which ought to be included, and included something which ought to have been omitted. There was a well-known legal maxim that the mention of one thing meant the exclusion of another, and would introduce an endless chaos of interpretation. Was it not, therefore, far better to leave the interpretation of a particular case to the conjoint opinion of the pension authorities, or to the Excise officers, and in the case of differences, to leave it to the patriarchal control and jurisdiction of the President of the Local Government Board to determine the matter.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said he agreed with the last two speakers in this matter, but he suggested that the better way to deal with the question was to have a general reference to what was the past year's income. In that way they would get a distinct figure to deal with, after the deductions in respect of payments to friendly societies, rent, etc., whereas to deal with the income of the coming year would be entirely speculative. Dealing with the past year, the receipts could be produced, and he submitted that if they desired to give the pension authorities and officers some indication as to how the income was to be arrived at, it would be more suitably done by specifying friendly society payments, and all outgoings of one sort or another, doing this at the end of the subsection rather than in the part they were now considering.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN thought the word "income" as it stood in the Bill was clearly not sufficient to meet the case raised by the hon. Member for Leicester, which the Prime Minister, as he understood, had expressed the desire and the intention of the Government to include. Therefore, he proposed, when they reached the proper point, to move, after the word "excluding," to insert the words, "any sums payable on premiums of insurance against sickness, death, or funeral expenses." That would specifically meet the case, which was a very exceptional one, and would not, he thought, be open to the objection raised by the Prime Minister, namely, that if they mentioned one thing they would exclude others. This was a case which stood by itself, and was altogether apart from the ordinary outgoings which had been spoken of. He thought it right to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer notice of his intention to move.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) suggested that after the word "income," the words might be inserted, "clear of all necessary outgoings."

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) said he would suggest another way in which the matter might be met, and which might not be open to the objection raised by his right hon. friend the Member for Dublin University. He would like to know the view of the Solicitor-General as to the use of the word "available" income, after deduction of reasonable payments and expenses. If they did not get a decision on this point to-day, it was one of the matters on which the Bill might perhaps be re-committed on Monday.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said they were being asked to decide this point on very insufficient information. The First Commissioner of Works had told them that if they left the word "income" alone it showed clearly what was meant. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that he rather thought that an allowance would be made by the pension officer in respect of insurance payments, but was not quite certain, and that an allowance might be made in respect of repairs to the old man's cottage, but he was not quite certain of that either. Then the Prime Minister had told them, in the first instance, that the rules and regulations which affected income-tax would probably be taken into account by the pension officer; but when he rose again the right hon. Gentleman took that back, and said the rules and regulations as to income-tax had nothing to do with this point. He thought they were reasonably entitled to have some leading from the Government. The Prime Minister had concluded by practically saying that the Government insisted on the word "income" being left alone, and that neither the word "clear" nor "net" should be put in. Yet it was admitted by the three Ministers who had spoken that the subject was being left in the greatest possible confusion. The answer of the Prime Minister had rather indicated to them that it would be in the discretion of the pension officers, of whom there would be some hundreds all over the country, to deal with some of these points. In view of the Bill having been so loosely drawn, in view of the different statements of Ministers, and in view of the vague state in which this point had been left, he thought they were entitled to protest, and to say that they were, at all events, clearly of opinion that the income should be "net," after those reasonable deductions which a poor old man or woman should be allowed to make in ascertaining the amount of income for the purpose of this clause, namely, payments to friendly societies, the weekly payments to a burial fund, and so forth. They were entitled to ask that the word "net" should be accepted, or in the alternative that the Minister in charge of the Bill should undertake that on Report some words would be put in which would clearly define what the income was that was to be taken into account, and how it was to be arrived at, what elements were to be included, and how the deductions were to be allowed. Unless something of that kind were done, they would be perpetrating a piece of injustice calculated to raise the greatest possible inconvenience and trouble all over the country. If, however, the Government, undertook to deal with this question properly on Report they might be able to make clear what income it was intended should be taken into account. Unless the Government were prepared to give one or other of these two assurances, he should certainly vote with his hon. friend opposite.

SIR JOHN RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth) said the one thing most clear about this matter was its obscurity, and if the Committee could not make clear the situation he did not see how the pension committees and Excise officers were to see their way through the fog. The word "available" had been suggested by his hon. friend, and that possibly might not be open to the objection of want of clearness. Not being a lawyer he was not able to make the point clearer, but he thought that some words might be introduced which would make the position less obscure. Somebody would have to decide it and if the committee did not it would be shelved, and the burden placed on somebody else's shoulders. Refusal to accept the Amendment did not end the difficulty. The pension committee would have to come to a conclusion on the matter if the House of Commons did not, and it was by no means an easy matter to come to a clear conclusion. *Tot homines tot sententiæ.* Almost as many opinions had been expressed as there had been speakers. "Net income" had a different meaning according to the tribunal that might have to decide the matter. "Clear" also had no definite meaning. He was rather driven to the conclusion which had been suggested that they ought to define either by way of exception or by introducing a schedule and putting into it exactly what they intended it to mean. The Prime Minister, he knew, said the schedule would introduce endless chaos of interpretation, but he thought the contrary would be the fact, and that there would be endless chaos if they did not do something. He could not see the difficulty himself of introducing exceptions or elaborating a schedule. He knew it meant trouble, and what the Secretary for War called clear thinking, but it was the bounden duty of the House of Commons to put the matter as clearly as possible for the benefit of the pension committees, otherwise very grave injustice might be done. It would make all the difference into what category a pensioner fell, whether they did or did not carve out certain outgoings from his income. Payments to friendly societies for death funds had been instanced. If they were not allowed to carve those out of the income it might cut a man out of an old-age pension altogether, and he hoped even now, almost at the eleventh hour and the fifty-ninth minute, the Government would help the committee. It was not a matter of party disputation or recrimination. They all wanted to do the best with the Bill as it had been put before them. To leave "income" would not do. It would leave it to someone else to work a way out of the fog, which the House was not able to do.

*Mr. SMEATON said that after the debate that had taken place, if he could get an assurance from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that some regulations would be issued for the guidance of the pension officers, so as to allow them to make a liberal reduction on the lines suggested, he was prepared to withdraw the Amendment. If not, he should go to a division.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 84; Noes, 310. (Division List No. 147.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Haddock, George B.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Stanier, Beville
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Smeaton and Mr. Watson Rutherford.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.

Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T(Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Dean (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Idris, T. H. W.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwick)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, PatrickA. (Queen'sCo.
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murphy, N. J. (Kilkenny, S.)
Murray,Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.

Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James (Galloway)
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

*MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.) moved to insert in the first line of subsection (*a*) the word "unearned" so that, in calculating the means of a person for the purposes of this Act, it should be the unearned income only that should be considered. He said his object was to save the applicants from the tender mercies of the pension committees. He looked upon those committees with some alarm, and anyone who read the various sections of Clause 4 would conclude that when these incomes had to be decided, in accordance with the sliding scale, the task would be difficult indeed. He desired to exclude from the provisions of this Clause all those persons who were earning their incomes. Subsection (*a*) was worded—

> "The income which that person may reasonably expect to receive."

He submitted that an old man of seventy to seventy-one could not be reasonably expected to earn any income for any considerable length of time, and this, taken in conjunction with the proviso that—

> "That income in the absence of other means of ascertaining the income, being taken to be the income actually received during the preceding year"—

would be very unfair to the old men earning a few shillings a week. Obviously the power to earn income decreased very rapidly after seventy, and if an old man was earning 9s. or 10s. a week in 1908, he could not reasonably be expected to earn as much in 1909. The pension committee under this clause would have to take it that he would be able to earn that income in the succeeding year. He invited the Chancellor of the Exchequer to compare the respective positions of an old man of seventy, possessing a house worth £200, bringing in 6s. a week, and an old man of seventy earning 11s. a week. The latter would receive 3s. under the sliding scale, whereas the owner of the house would receive 5s. a week. Therefore the property owner would be in a superior position as compared with the man earning his income. The object of this measure was to have regard to the past services of a man to the community. The man earning his income was still performing services to the community, and he ought to receive his pension over and above any amount he might be earning. That man ought to receive the 5s. a week, quite apart from the 10s. or 11s. he received as wages. He would be quite willing to accept some definition of "unearned," although that had not been considered necessary in the case of the income-tax. He was also willing to accept a limitation as to the incomes of those to whom this particular provision should apply. As an alternative he suggested that instead of saying "the unearned income" they should say "the income in the form of rent or interest which that person may reasonably expect to receive."

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 6, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'unearned.'"—(*Mr. Chiozza Money.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'unearned' be there inserted."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that obviously it was impossible for the Government to accept the Amendment. He rather complained that it had been moved without any estimate being given as to what it would cost. He thought the Government was entitled to ask hon. Members who moved Amendments of this sort what, in their judgment, would be the cost, because if they did not give that information the Committee was not in possession of all the case. He wondered whether the hon. Member had the slightest idea of what it would cost to accept this Amendment without any limitation.

*MR. CHIOZZA MONEY said he had stated most clearly that he was quite willing to limit it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he had to consider the Amendment on the Paper. The Lord Chancellor might receive a pension of 5s. a week, or the Attorney-General, so long as they spent all their earnings. A man in business might be earning as much at seventy years of age as at fifty, because his business might have developed. A workman, if he worked hard and broke down in health after managing to save enough money to build a house, was to be penalised under the Amendment. That was so unfair that he did not think it was necessary to dwell any further upon it. Again, the Amendment would not only add at least another £750,000 to the cost of the Act, but it would be chiefly for the benefit of the well-to-do. He hoped the Committee would confine the Bill to the more destitute instead of to those who were better off.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN agreed that it would be impossible to accept an Amendment of this kind. The hon. Member who moved it, however, had called attention to a very real difficulty, and had he confined his observations to that point his case would have been a good deal stronger. As an illustration, the hon. Member inquired how a pension authority would calculate under this Bill the income of an old man who had in the past year been able to earn a few shillings a week, and had secured an average wage during the year of 8s. a week. The continuance of that would be dependent upon the goodwill of an employer, because such wages would probably be paid, not merely for present services, but in recognition of a long life spent on an estate or an old connection with the works. Consequently such an income would be largely dependent upon the continued existence of the person from whom it was received and also upon the continued good health of the recipient. The hon. Member would avoid any difficulty by excluding that case altogether.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he wished to point out a serious difficulty that would arise if the Amendment were not accepted. Supposing an old man of sixty-nine was earning wages amounting to a few pence less than 10s. Instead of continuing to work that man under this Bill would deliberately give up his job in order that on reaching seventy he should not have an income of 10s. a week, whereas if the word "unearned" were inserted he would go on earning that money. It was very desirable that he should be encouraged to do that, and be allowed to continue to receive his pension. Why should such an Amendment not be considered on the ground that the cost had not been worked out? If the Bill were passed in its present shape every person approaching seventy years of age would immediately give up any little occupation he might be carrying on and in which he was earning a few shillings a week, and society generally would be all the poorer for the loss of that useful labour which old people should be encouraged to perform. He thought they should have had more encouragement from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If the Amendment had been accepted, it would have been made clear that if a man in the country was earning half-a-crown a week as a scarecrow, or something of that sort—[Laughter]. There were people in society who were not earning half-a-crown a week, and he thought the Committee might have some respect for the old man who was earning half-a-crown a week in a humble occupation of that kind. Why should he be precluded from receiving a pension, and thereby penalised because he was doing a little work? If the Amendment was pressed to a division, he would vote for it.

Question put, and negatived.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) moved to amend subsection (*a*) by inserting after "the income which that person may reasonably expect to receive" the words "as of right." The first difficulty he had in his mind was that in the case of a man who was receiving 10s. or 12s. a week as a pension, or from other sources. Unless some such words as he proposed were inserted—he was not sure that the words he proposed were the best for the purpose—the result would be that the State would be making a present to the employer of the difference between 10s. or 12s. a week and 8s. a week. If a man was receiving 12s. a week before this scheme came into operation, his total income under the sliding scale would be 13s. That was clear from the sliding scale, and unless they made an Amendment of this kind it appeared to him that it would be the interest of all those people, whoever they were, whether employers of labour or charitable agencies, to reduce the payments to 8s., so that their pensioners would be in precisely the same position as now. That was a difficulty which must be met in one way or another. There was another difficulty if this clause remained as it was. So far as he could see the unhappy pensioner would have to bring into account every little present he received. If he got 10s. as a Christmas box that would have to come into the account; and, if he was allowed a little tea and sugar by an old employer, that also would have to come into the account. He did not think the framers of the clause had any idea of the stringency of its terms. Every conceivable thing was brought into account by the Bill. He was not exaggerating, as hon. Members would find if they turned to the Bill. Subsection (*a*), which they were discussing at present, merely dealt with cash, and it would bring in the Christmas-box. Subsection (*b*)—

> "The yearly value of any advantage accruing to that person from the use or enjoyment of any property belonging to him which was personally used or enjoyed by him."—

would hit the person who was living in a house of his own. Subsection (*c*)—

> "The yearly income which might be expected to be derived from any property belonging to that person which, though capable of investment or profitable use, is not so invested or profitably used by him"—

meant that if he had £5 in a stocking, it would have to be brought into the account. Subsection (*d*)—

> "The yearly value of any benefit or privilege enjoyed by that person"—

would include tea, sugar and milk. That was a very severe clause indeed, and he suggested that the Government must do something to limit it, otherwise if the unhappy pensioner did not make a return of all these things, he would come under the penalties of the Act, which were very severe. Clause 9 provided that any person who, for the purpose of obtaining an old-age pension, made a false statement or a false representation would be liable on conviction to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, with hard labour. He did not believe the Government intended that, but at the same time that was the proposal of the Bill. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 3, line 7, after the word 'receive,' to insert the words 'as of right.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was perfectly clear from the speech of the noble Lord that this Amendment was not at all relevant to subsection (*a*), but to the subsections which came later in the clause. The noble Lord's criticism was not directed to the subsection with which they were now dealing as to income, but to the subsections dealing with benefits and privileges. If that was the case, the Amendment ought to be moved at a later stage. He could not follow the noble Lord in his criticism of the later subsections. He did not think it was a convenient method to discuss subsection (*b*) when dealing with an Amendment to subsection (*a*). If they did so they would get into such a state that it would be absolutely impossible to get on with business. They would be able to discuss the whole matter if they would only discuss it a little more concisely. He thought the Committee could have discussed the whole of this clause in the seven or eight hours they had at their disposal. He agreed that the points raised by the noble Lord would have to be discussed, and he would give explanations when the later subsections came on. There were only two or three points of substance in the clause, and with the assistance of the noble Lord and of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen they were fair matters for clearing up, but if he started to clear up subsections (*b*), (*c*), and (*d*), before they disposed of subsection (*a*)——

Lord R. CECIL: What about Christmas boxes?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is 10s. in cash, and I do not agree that that comes under subsection (*a*). As a matter of fact it would not come under subsection (*b*) either.

Lord R. CECIL: It would come under subsection (*a*).

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said it would not in his opinion. If a man made his income from tips, he would include that. But that was a matter for discussion. There were some who were really paid in tips. There were waiters who were supposed to pay for being allowed to enter certain restaurants, because they looked to the tips for their income. All that sort of thing had to be considered by the pension officer and the pension committee. That was why it would be absolutely impossible to deal with every specific case in a clause of this kind. These matters would have to be left—he would not say to the discretion of the officer, but to the consideration of the officer, and that was why he could not accept the words of the Amendment. He had taken the trouble that morning to take four or five of the earlier Amendments on the Paper and to count what the additional cost would be if they were carried. He thought the Committee would be interested to know——

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman is now proceeding to refer to other Amendments. Is that in order?

*The CHAIRMAN: I think the right hon. Gentleman would be very well advised not to give these figures, because it is exactly that kind of information which widens the area of discussion and makes it impossible for me to keep it within proper limits.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said his point was this. The difficulty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was to find the money. When he was confronted with these Amendments which involved additional cost he was bound to point out to the Committee, subject to the Chairman's ruling, that it was impossible to say what all these accumulated additions would amount to, but it was certain that they would amount to such a preposterous sum that it would be quite impossible for any Chancellor of the Exchequer to face the task of finding the money. He would deal with the later Amendments when they came to them. The first Amendment would have demanded £750,000; and here was another amendment by the noble Lord which asked for £500,000 to meet the case of some 40,000 persons—not very poor persons at that—who were receiving 10s. or 11s. a week pensions as old labourers on estates. The Committee would see that these two Amendments, which involved an additional £1,250,000 to the charge on the Exchequer, were moved not even with any confidence, because, as his hon. friend the Member for Paddington said: "Any other sort of words would do; it is not the words I ask the Committee to adopt." The noble Lord asked the same thing: "I do not think these words are very well expressed; the Government may take another form of words." But when it was proposed to add an additional £1,250,000 to the national expenditure hon. Members ought to be a little more careful. These were the kind of drawbacks to such Amendments; they went on by stages at something like £500,000 per Amendment. It was impossible for the Government to accept the Amendment.

MR. CHAPLIN (Surrey, Wimbledon) said he entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it was extremely inconvenient to discuss the Bill in Committee under the existing methods. But whose fault was that? It was certainly not the fault of those on that side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman objected to the course taken by hon. Gentlemen in moving Amendments by which they could make their voices heard on a subject of special and particular interest to them, or, it might be, on subjects differing from that dealt with by his noble friend which would cause great hardship and cruelty to many people in the country. Hon. Members ought not to be condemned for so doing, because that was the only possible chance they had of getting a hearing at all in defence of these poor people. If there was any trouble at all in this matter it arose from the course the Government decided to take from the first and before they had even seen an Amendment on the Paper.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that that is not germane to the Amendment before the Committee. It is out of order to question the decision of the House.

MR. CHAPLIN: I was not referring to the action of the House, but to the action of the Government.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is the old excuse. The House has passed the Resolution, and it is not competent for the Committee to reflect on it.

MR. CHAPLIN said that when the right hon. Gentleman challenged the procedure of hon. Members on that side of the House, he thought he was within his right in defending them against the charge made against them. He did not intend to discuss this particular Amendment on that occasion. As to the estimates which the right hon. Gentleman had made in regard to the cost of this and further Amendments——

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I did not refer to further Amendments.

MR. CHAPLIN: Well, in regard to the Amendment they were discussing now. If the right hon. Gentleman found himself in difficulty because Amendments were moved entailing further cost on the Treasury and further provision to be made by the Government, again who was to blame? Not hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House. Their complaint had been from the outset that the Bill had not been thought out as it ought to have been. If it had been, the right hon. Gentleman would have foreseen the necessity of making provision for these cases of hardship about which great complaints were made. The justice of his observation had been proved over and over again, because the right hon. Gentleman had given way. and willingly given way, to them in the course of the debates.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he had abstained from taking part in these discussions, for he felt that no legal right was given under the Bill at all at present and therefore the discussions were merely of words. The pension was to be given by means of a relieving officer or pensions committee, just as poor relief was now given by the boards of guardians; therefore the discussions on legal points were perfectly out of place. But the Amendment moved by his noble friend raised a most important point—looked at from the point of view of this very extraordinary section about ascertaining a man's income and the concrete instance given by the noble Lord. Supposing by some sort of fortune or good luck a man had a legacy left him in one year of, say, £25, or that he happened to have had a benefactor, or a friendly old employer, who had given him a dole of £20 or £30; if the benefactor died and it was well known that that man would never again receive a legacy or dole, under this extraordinarily drawn scheme that man would be excluded from the benefit of the pension, because they would be bound to take his income as the exact amount of money actually received during the preceding year. Surely the right hon. Gentleman could not have meant that. That was not merely a legal technicality; the point went to the root of the meaning of the section. Surely the right hon. Gentleman could not mean that any absolutely voluntary payment made to a man during the year 1908 would exclude that man from receiving a pension in 1909. If that was not meant, then the words proposed by the hon. Member must be inserted in this line, and also in line 11. He gathered from the right hon. Gentleman's shaking his head that that was not, in his view, the meaning of the section, but he pressed to have some words put in to make it clear that any voluntary payment made during the year would not prevent a man getting his pension in the following year.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said he thought his hon. and learned friend had not given his usually vigilant care and attention to the section under review. He agreed that "income" was a very vague word. It occurred in many statutes for different objects. It had received a rather different scope in such statutes as the Insolvent Debtors Act and other Acts, where "income" had to be construed in each case according to the general purpose of the statute. "Income" under the Income Tax Act would not cover voluntary payments unless they were of the character of a clergyman's Easter offerings or a waiter's tips. In each particular case it was left to the assessor to say what was the character of a particular payment which was to be treated as income. In this case they could not give a perfectly precise and accurate definition of the word. All that they could do was to define the tribunal, and to say that in this case they were going to have a particular person, the pension officer, who was to be entrusted with a wide discretion governed by the general meaning of the clause. What was the general meaning of the clause in so far as the Amendment was concerned? A great deal had been said about voluntary payments which might be made in one year and next year be taken as part of the income; but if one looked at the clause as it was they would arrive at substantial agreement that where there was a legacy it would not be treated as income. There were undoubtedly some cases in which it might be argued that a voluntary payment should be treated as income—"the income which a person might reasonably expect to receive." That again covered some of the cases mentioned by the noble Lord. As to the case of a mere casual tip, that would not necessarily enter into the anticipated income for the succeeding year.

LORD R. CECIL said he agreed that he was putting the case of a casual gift. As the hon. and learned Gentleman knew, there were a large number of cases where it was the custom to give a small sum regularly at Christmas.

SIR W. ROBSON said that matters of that kind, having regard to the complexity of human relations, could not be dealt with to a degree of precision. They should be left to the discretion of the pension officer. Then by steps and stages they arrived at the income which might reasonably be expected next year. A mode of ascertaining the income in the absence of other means would be by taking the amount of the previous year, and if he as Excise officer had to construe the section he would exclude voluntary gifts unless there was reasonable likelihood of their recurring. Absolute uniformity could not be obtained or provided for. In the succeeding subsections property was dealt with, and in the last the yearly value of any benefit or privilege, and there was quite enough to indicate to the pension officer the way in which he should set about ascertaining income apart from voluntary and casual payments.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said there could not be a greater contrast than between the speech they had just heard and that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Committee was indebted to the Attorney-General for arguing upon the different sections which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had waived aside with an *obiter dictum* as irrelevant, and, indeed, suggesting that his noble friend had introduced them into the discussion for the purpose of wasting time.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE denied that he had said so.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the right hon. Gentleman, with some show of irritation, had said there would be plenty of time to discuss this point if hon. Members did not waste time by discussing subsections which were not relevant. The Attorney-General invited the Committee to look at subsections (*b*), (*c*), and (*d*). He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer before administering undeserved rebukes would consult the Attorney-General as to the meaning of the Bill he had in charge. He desired to call the attention of the Attorney-General to the effect of his arguments on a large class of benefactions enjoyed by people who might expect to benefit under the Bill. He agreed with the Attorney-General that it was impossible to meet every case by exact definition, but there should be certain guiding principles showing a clear idea of what was intended. It was quite true that the Excise officer was subject to the control of the President of the Local Government Board, and that that gentleman in turn was subject to the control of Parliament, but it would certainly be undesirable to have an annual discussion on the reduction of the salary of the right hon. Gentleman on the question of the exact interpretation which he had or should have put on the words of the Act. Should there be taken into account for estimate of income such doles or gifts as were given by charitable institutions or individuals? It was probable that an old person would receive gifts for successive years to which he had no right, and for which he could make no claim. He did not quite know the attitude of the Government on this point. The Attorney-General, speaking of a casual gift, such as a Christmas-box, said he should not himself take into account anything unless there was a reasonable likelihood of the same thing occurring in the subsequent year. That was clear under the terms of the Bill. But ought it to be taken into account if there was a reasonable likelihood of its occurring. Ought they to take into account charitable gifts, either from individuals, friendly societies, endowed charities, or any source of that kind? In his opinion they ought not. Let them suppose that at the present time there was a charity which gave an old-age pension. Some societies did give pensions, and others money grants and doles at certain stated intervals in the year. It was probable that the persons who received those gifts last year would receive them this year, and as long as they lived. The probability being admitted, ought those charitable gifts from those charitable funds and benefactions from private individuals to be taken into account? Surely they ought to be in addition to and not in subvention of anything the State might give. It was quite clear that there were cases in which such societies as he spoke of would desire to supplement the allowance given by the State. If such subventions brought the man within the limits of the sliding scale, were they at once to reduce the pension? They certainly ought not. The case in favour of not reducing the pension in the case of private benefactions was even greater. It was quite possible that though people might continue to make these charitable grants after the pension was given, they certainly would not do so if the only result was to relieve the Exchequer. Even if those gifts were taken into account there would not be the escape from the additional expenditure of £500,000 to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred, because people would cease to make gifts if they were made the grounds of reducing or refusing a pension. He should certainly support the Amendment.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said there was an extraordinary contrast between the speech of the Attorney-General and the attitude taken up by the Government a couple of days before. The Attorney-General gave as a reason for rejecting the Amendment that all these matters must be left to the pension committee, and in their discretion they must decide what an income was. As the Government had adopted a sliding scale, that meant that the committee was to decide what pension a person was to have. A couple of days ago an Amendment was proposed to give discretion to the committee, an Amendment which he supported on grounds of humanity. The Government refused to accept that because they said no discretion ought to be left to the pension committee; but now, according to the Attorney-General, everything was to be left to the pension committee. That seemed a very important admission. They now knew the mind of the Government. These pensions were not to be given as a right, and they were only charitable pensions to be given by pension committees instead of boards of guardians.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the formidableness of this proposal could be measured by the fact that it would involve £500,000 a year. He did not think that they could escape that £500,000 a year. Instead of allowing the House to decide whether that £500,000 a year should be placed on the backs of the taxpayers, they were going to leave it to the chance selection of pension committees and pension officers, with the prospect, as the Attorney-General had reminded them, that was experienced in the case of the clergyman's Easter offering, which, like a shuttlecock, passed between the Court of first instance and the Court of Appeal, and eventually was decided on a final appeal to the highest Court of the Empire. The Attorney-General might revel in that prospect, but the humble pensioner would not regard it with the same delight, because what he required was a scientific way of deciding the question. These varying payments took the form of cash payments, and it would have to be settled some time or other how they were to be dealt with; but if they did not decide how they were to be dealt with for the purpose of calculating pensions, they would not only be throwing the duties of that House on to the shoulders of irresponsible subordinate officers, but they would be going further and putting power in the hands of the donors of these merely revocable and precarious payments to place this burden on the Exchequer. He hoped the House would make up its mind to settle this question once for all.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said the clause as it stood would give an infinity of trouble, and lead to a good deal of injustice when the Imperial officer came to attend to the matter. He could not understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he said the Amendment would add 40,000 people to the pension list. He could not conceive that there would be any poor persons at all in the country over seventy years of age whose income would be over 7s. or 8s., and then they were to get 4s. or 5s., as a graduated scale had been adopted. His belief was that the working of the Act in country districts would show that everyone's hand would be against the Imperial officer of the pension committee, and that everyone would be in league to defeat the Exchequer. They could picture an old man of seventy, probably very hard of hearing, and not having the benefit of a very good board school education, such as was now given, being called before the Imperial officer, or pension committee, to make out what his income was last year, and what his income might reasonably be expected to be next year. Would he remember the few extra days he had been employed threshing, or the time when he went out with a battue? It would not be to the old man's interest to remind the authorities of the facts, and how were they or the Imperial officer to find out? When they came to the question of the Poor Law the whole question was absolutely different. The greater number of the guardians were fairly large ratepayers, and it was in their interests, when a man applied for relief, to find out all about him, to see whether he was really destitute, so that they might not spend the ratepayers' money wrongly. But in this case every man who came before the pension authorities would have his hand against them; every hand in the district would be against the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Certainly in the country districts the number of people with incomes of 8s. 6d. or 9s. would be *nil*, and they would find plenty with incomes of 7s. 6d. of 8s. in order to get the 5s. He could not conceive how they were to arrive at the amount of a poor old man's income when he was called up to give evidence of what money he had earned. He might have forgotten that he had been employed two or three months in the year previous, and the end of it would be that the old man would have given a false return, for which he would be liable to six months imprisonment, although it was perfectly certain that no magistrate and no jury would convict. He could not conceive that the Government had given proper attention to the subject, and he would be surprised if the Imperial officer was able to decide points in dispute to the satisfaction of both parties—the old man of seventy and the representative of the taxpayers.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) said that this point was of such importance that they would like to have the view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon it. In Ireland a large section of the population were assisted by their friends in America. In some cases they sent a few pounds, perhaps £5, and the remittances came fitfully. Under this scheme it would be difficult to arrive at an understanding of what the pension officers were to do in the matter. The Attorney-General had said that such a sum as £5 coming to a person in Ireland from America would not be taken into account as part of the income. If that was the view of the Attorney-General, he thought it was necessary that the Government should put something to that effect in the Bill. Sometimes as much as £100 was sent from America to poor families in Ireland, and, according to a later subsection of this clause, if it was to be read literally, the sum which was received last year as income was to be taken as foreshadowing what the income would be next year. Of course, the pensioner would then be precluded from receiving his pension. The man who received the £100 might invest it in securities at home, and if he received only 3 per cent. it would be classed as income and he would be precluded from receiving the pension in the succeeding year. He thought the Government ought to face the problem of charitable contributions and be done with it. Were they to pass this clause without any definition whatever, or were they to accept an Amendment such as was suggested by the noble Lord, who wished to put in the words "as of right," which at all events would do something to place a limitation as to what a person's income was? This subsection, like many other parts of the Bill, was a mystery. It had been so hurriedly drafted that the Government themselves could not explain it. It was left to the Opposition to make the Bill workable, and when they did their best to correct mistakes in drafting they were told that they were wasting the time of the House. He thought that if they wanted to pass this subsection the words suggested by his noble friend ought to be inserted.

SIR F. BANBURY said he was afraid that he could not support the Amendment of his noble friend. The hon. Member for Preston had shown that the Government were inconsistent in refusing his Amendment a day or two ago, and now they were going for a different reason to refuse the Amendment of his noble friend. He did not expect consistency from the Government, and he therefore listened to the arguments advanced on each Amendment, and did not bother to consider whether they were consistent with what had been said previously. He had come to the conclusion that the argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was unanswerable. There were many cases in which 15s., 17s., 18s., or a £1 a week was given to old servants or old employees. There was no legal liability on the part of the donors, who could withdraw the payments, and the recipients had no legal means of enforcing them. If his noble friend's Amendment were carried, all these people would be included, and they would be receiving in addition to 15s., 17s., 18s., or a £1 a week another 5s. a week. That was a very serious burden to place on the taxpayer, and he did not think the people themselves were in a sufficiently necessitous position to call for their having the extra 5s. Take the case of a person receiving 13s. a week. His noble friend said that the man's income would be reduced to 8s. in order that the balance might be made up with the 5s. paid by the State. Generally speaking, he agreed with his noble friend, but on this occasion he really must support the Government. He found himself in a curious position. He had voted twice for the Government on the previous day, and apparently he was to do so again. He really thought, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would excuse his saying so, that his argument ought to have some weight with the House. They could not go on piling up these additional sums of money. He stood there endeavouring to do his duty by the nation as a whole.

Sir E. CARSON asked whether, in the computation of incomes, purely voluntary allowances would be included. He understood the Attorney-General thought they would not, and he would have assumed that himself from the word "income." He should assume that if he told a man he might rely on his giving him 10s. a week for the rest of his life, that was not within the meaning of the section.

Sir W. ROBSON said he had dealt with the subject somewhat fully before. He thought in the great bulk of cases voluntary payments would not be treated as income. But the Committee would hardly expect him to go over the same ground again. There were some voluntary payments which he could well imagine would be treated as income where they came within the wording of the Bill as being reasonably likely to recur. But he refrained from laying down any universal proposition with regard to voluntary payments.

Lord R. CECIL said that in view of the failure of the Government to answer the two points that he had put, he would have no alternative but to proceed to a division. Let him just re-state those two points, so as to make it quite clear. The first was that unless they had some such provision as this they would be exposing any pensioner who did not disclose the fact that he received 10s. as a Christmas gift, not only to imprisonment, but to repayment of the money. It was simply to protect the pensioner from a harassing prosecution, it might be, by a village enemy. He was satisfied that some such words must be put in to deal with that case, unless they were going to run the risk of grave injustice. The second point was that unless they put in some such words they were in effect making a grant not to the old and poverty-stricken industrial labourers, as they were called, but to those who were paying at this moment pensions to those men. He agreed that his words might go a little too far, but as the Government were evidently not disposed to meet them at all in the matter, he would have no alternative but to divide the Committee.

Sir W. ROBSON said the noble Lord had inadvertently used phraseology which might give rise to some misapprehension with regard to the application of penalties under the Bill. He had said that if an applicant for a pension made a false return he would be liable to this, that, and the other. But he was not called on under the Bill to make a return. What he was called upon to do was to refrain from making false representations. There was a very material difference. The penalty was not for failure to make a return. It attached only to a positive mis-statement.

Lord R. CECIL: If he says his income is so much a year, and does not include in it the 10s., or whatever it may be, it will be a false statement.

Mr. RAWLINSON wanted to make perfectly clear the point they were at now. The Attorney-General had said that voluntary payments which were reasonably likely to recur would be treated as a man's income. The case which he had in his mind was that of a man who was receiving three sums of 4s. each from his three sons. What he wanted to make perfectly clear was that the Bill meant to treat that as income and the Amendment proposed that it should not be treated as income, and that the applicant should be entitled to his pension just as if his sons were not making these onerous contributions.

An. HON. MEMBER: They could reduce their allowance.

Mr. RAWLINSON pointed out that the clause stated that in the absence of other means of ascertaining income, it should be taken to be the income actually received during the preceding year. In this case the 12s. would be taken as being his income for the next year.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 134; Noes, 298. (Division List No. 148.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barnes, G. N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc,
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clive, Percy Archer
Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Jowett, F. W.
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kelley, George D.
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James S. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Grady, J.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, James (Halifax)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesal
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Stanley Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S Pancras, W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd

Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W. H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
DunneMajor E.Martin(Walsall
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gurdon,RtHn.Sir W.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey W. E.(Derbyshire,N.E
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey

Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Idris, T. H. W.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lardner, James Carrige Rushe
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.(Queen'sCo.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, N. J. (Kilkenny, S.)
Murray,Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)

O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.

Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

*MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes) moved to amend the clause by excluding from the calculation of means "any sums of a less annual value than £40 received in consideration of previous contributions to a registered friendly society or trade union." He said that some time since the Chancellor of the Exchequer had attempted through the Chief Registrar to ascertain what were the views of great friendly societies with regard to various points in connection with the introduction of a scheme of old-age pensions. The Registrar put certain questions to the societies, and with regard to the bulk of those questions the societies were unwilling to commit their members in view of the divergent views of the same. On one point only did those applied to feel at liberty to express a strong and decided opinion. On one point only were they absolutely unanimous. They were agreed as to the great harm which would result to the cause of thrift if it were enacted that the receipt of a weekly allowance from a friendly society should wholly or in part disentitle an individual to the receipt of a pension, and very rightly so, for how was it possible more effectually to discourage thrift amongst the poor than by providing that by their very efforts to be thrifty, by their very self-denial, exercised probably at the cost of their own comfort, a poor man should penalise himself, should deprive himself of the pension to which he would otherwise be entitled? The Bill as drafted was the very reverse of an incentive to thrift. It penalised thrift. If the Government thought fit to accept his Amendment, the Bill would then give the poor every incentive to thrift, every incentive to add by contributing to a friendly society to the 5s. that would come to him in old age, and which after all was but a small pittance. Allusion had been frequently made to the case of New Zealand, where the pension scheme was already in existence. What was the provision in the New Zealand Act? It was as follows—

"Income shall be deemed to include personal earnings, but not any payment by way of sick allowance or funeral benefit from any friendly society."

In consequence of this provision old-age pensions had not prejudiced the position of the friendly societies. In New Zealand the Manchester Unity Order of Oddfellows was just as active as it was at home, and what said their Report? It was to the effect that—

"Since the carrying of an Old-Age Pension Act the operations of the Manchester Unity Order of Oddfellows have increased at a rate of five times as great as in any other country."

It might be asked why thrift through a friendly society should be specially guarded. Why should not individual thrift be guarded in the same way? That criticism had been made by those sitting around him, but he held that the communal thrift inculcated by a friendly society, based on the mutual interests of members, was entitled to even more consideration than the thrift which was stimulated solely by the interests of the individual. And, moreover, they had already conceded this principle in the Outdoor Relief Friendly Societies Act, which had been passed some years since, and by which guardians of the poor were enabled to neglect any sums up to 5s. received weekly from a friendly society. He now came to the Amendment. Why had he fixed £40 as the limit? He had been informed that there were a large number of members of friendly societies who had contributed for a sickness benefit of over 12s. per week, receipt of which would, of course, debar them from a pension. It might be said, why not lay down that the limitation of income should not take into account any sums received as sick pay or superannuation pay from a friendly society or a trade union? In view, however, of their declarations, the Government would probably be unwilling to go thus far. They would insist upon some limit. Some trade unions, he believed, gave a superannuation grant of 10s. to 15s. a week. Fifteen shillings per week meant £39 per annum, so that his limit of £40 admitted of the individual receiving 15s. a week from a friendly society without penalisation. He had sufficiently detained the Committee. Be it remembered that putting aside trade unions, with regard to which other members would speak, the work of friendly societies was enormous, he might almost say wonderful. Their membership amounted to 6,000,000; their funds were £50,000,000 sterling; the payment of annual benefits amounted to £5,000,000. How important it was in the interests, not only of friendly societies, but of the State that this good work should not be hampered! Still more important was it that the thrift which a man practised to provide for himself in times of sickness or old age should not be made the excuse for depriving him of a pension which would be paid to a less thrifty man. And now with regard to expense. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said the day before that no Amendments of this kind ought to be proposed without calculation of the cost, but as the Chancellor of the Exchequer knew, it was impossible for them without expert aid to calculate the cost. But with regard to the expense, speaking for himself, he (Mr. Mildmay) would rather see some reduction in the general amount of pension voted: he would rather see this, distasteful as it would be to him, than he would see such unjust, such unequal, he might say such impossible provisions in the Bill as had been passed by the House of Commons the day before. He was aware that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said on the previous Wednesday that further concessions were impossible, but he was hoping that they had been pondering over the dictum of the hon. Member below the gangway sitting upon the Labour Benches, to the effect that consistency was but a scurvy virtue. Indeed the Government had often given them cause by their actions to think that they were not averse to taking that view at times. Seriously the whole House, and he was certain the whole country, were anxious for some such concessions as were foreshadowed in this Amendment, and he most sincerely hoped that the Government would consider the possibility of acceding to it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'cash,' to insert the words 'excluding any sums of a less annual value than forty pounds received in consideration of previous contributions to a registered friendly society, or trade union, and.'"—(*Mr. Mildmay.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. L. HARCOURT said he would explain why the Government could hardly be expected to accept this Amendment. In their opinion they could not exclude from the income test only those societies mentioned in the Amendment. If they did so they would be driving thrift into a narrow and specified channel—he did not say it was a bad channel—and would thereby be discouraging small investments in industries of all kinds. To distinguish income derived from thrift, or savings, or whatever they liked to call it, from other income was almost impossible in many cases. He would give a rough example. How were they to decide what were savings in the case of a man who inherited some years ago, say from his father, £150, who had saved another £150, and put both sums into a house or a cottage, or an investment of that kind? How were they to decide how much of that was due to his own savings or thrift, and how much was due to what he had inherited from his father? Were they going to decide off-hand that the £150 which was inherited was in no sense savings? It might be regarded as savings because he had not spent it.

Mr. MILDMAY: That is outside of my Amendment.

Mr. L. HARCOURT said he was sorry if he had wandered outside of the Amendment. If the hon. Member's Amendment was accepted, it was clear that other Amendments must be passed to extend to all investments. It was impossible to make out a selected schedule for this purpose. It would have to be extended to building societies and to many other societies of that kind, including savings-banks and co-operative societies, and even to investments in gold mines. People's ideas as to thrift in the matter of investments might vary, and if this was extended to sums received from friendly societies and trade unions, it would have to be extended to other concerns beyond what in the ordinary sense were termed provident institutions. It might reasonably take the form of putting money into the stock-in-trade of a small business from which a person earned his income. A man might have his savings invested in a small cottage, or he might have put them into something which would help him to earn enough to live upon. Contributions to the societies mentioned were taken in the Bill as proof of thrift, where it was necessary that an applicant for a pension should produce proof of his thrift; but to exclude those societies from the income test and not to exempt also investments of savings in building societies and co-operative societies would be an unreasonable thing. He was informed that if the Amendment was accepted 20,000 additional persons would become eligible for pensions at the cost of a quarter of a million sterling.

Sir F. BANBURY said he did not intend to move the Amendment of which he had given notice, to exclude sums received "from any investment made out of the savings of that person."

Mr. CHAPLIN said the only substantial objection which the First Commissioner of Works took to the Amendment was that it was so limited. That was a difficulty which could easily be got over. The Amendment might easily be widened, and before he concluded he would move to insert words which would remove the objection which the right hon. Gentleman entertained. He would propose to enlarge the scope of the Amendment by moving to omit all the words after "friendly" in order to insert "provident or other society or trade union, or from such other approved provision against old age, sickness, or infirmity as may be recognised as proper provision for the purpose by regulations under this Act." He did not think the right hon. Gentleman could take exception to these words, because they were the words of an Amendment which the Government moved and carried last night after the guillotine had fallen. It was quite true that the Amendment was moved last night in regard to another matter, but he thought that rather strengthened his position. The Amendment moved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer last night introduced words by which the disqualification of the idler for a pension was upheld, but the right hon. Gentleman made the concession that if a man in that position had contributed for ten years to a friendly or other society, or had given other proof of thrift, he was to obtain the benefit of the old-age pension scheme. The First Commissioner of Works had now informed the Committee that contributions to a friendly society were to be taken as proof that a man might be entitled to a pension.

Mr. L. HARCOURT: Not disentitled.

Mr. CHAPLIN said the Chancellor of the Exchequer went a great deal further than that the other day, and, therefore, he could not see how the Government could refuse to accept this Amendment. On 19th June a deputation from friendly societies waited on the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the right hon. Gentleman said he was the last man in the world to lack appreciation of the services rendered to the community by friendly societies; on the contrary, he was making membership a qualification, for a friendly society would be able to put on their notice paper: "Membership of this society is a certificate for old-age pensions." Under these circumstances he did not understand on what ground the Government offered any hostility to the enlargement of the Amendment by the addition of the words which he was going to move. The object his hon. friend and himself had in view was to remove the discouragement of thrift which was so manifest in the Bill, and which, if allowed to stand, must have the most injurious effect on the community. The First Commissioner of Works calculated the cost of the Amendment at a quarter of a million sterling.

Mr. L. HARCOURT: I am informed that I greatly under-estimated the cost.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That only confirms what we have said over and over again, that this Bill has never been thought out by the Exchequer.

Mr. L. HARCOURT: It was my blunder. I had the correct figures here, but I misquoted them.

Mr. CHAPLIN said that even so the loss of revenue would be far less injurious to the community than the harm that would be done to the friendly societies by the direct discouragement of thrift contained in the Bill. Upon that there was evidence to any extent they pleased. The statements with regard to the views of the friendly societies on this point were put before the House. What was the drift of their opinion on the question of thrift? Taking them all through, according to the best calculation he had been able to make, they were more than two to one of opinion that the Bill, in its unamended form at all events—for he insisted that very little improvement had been made since on the subject of thrift—was extremely injurious in that aspect. He had been told that although the large majority of the friendly societies were of that opinion, on the other hand if the number of members were counted the majority were in favour of a non-contributory scheme, and that that was a matter that ought to be taken into consideration, and that that would make this reference less unfavourable to the Government. But the largest friendly society in the United Kingdom, the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows, gave no answer to that return. It was not needed, because the Grand Master at their recent annual conference—and silence gave consent to his words—stated as clearly and definitely as he could that a non-contributory Bill was as mischievous as could be, and that he was entirely opposed to the plan of the Government. He could quote any number of other cases if necessary. He had quoted a good many on the Second Reading of this Bill; but he did not think it was necessary to say more in support of his hon. friend's Amendment. He proposed himself, with the permission of the Committee, to move as an Amendment to the Amendment of his noble friend, "To leave out after the word 'friendly' the rest of the Amendment, and to insert 'provident or other society or trade union or from such other body provision against old age, sickness or infirmity as may be recognised as a proper provision for the purpose by regulations under this Act.'" He begged to move.

The CHAIRMAN said he would have to alter the form of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment so as to exclude "trade union."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"To add at the end, the words 'provident or other society, or from such other approved provision against old age, sickness, or infirmity, as may be recognised as proper provision for this purpose by regulations under this Act, and'"—(*Mr. Chaplin.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*Mr. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said it was rather surprising to him that the Government, which only the previous day proposed and carried an Amendment to the effect that investments in friendly societies should be taken as a sign of thrift, should object to this Amendment. His right hon. friend had referred to the returns made by the different friendly societies, and he would read to the Committee the resolution which since the return had been unanimously passed by the conference of the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows—

"That this annual conference of the Manchester Unity Friendly Society, while approving the proposal to provide State pensions for aged and necessitous workers, strongly urges upon the Government and the House of Commons the desirability of ensuring that no person who would otherwise be eligible for the State allowance shall be deprived thereof because of the receipt of sickness or superannuation benefit from a friendly society."

That was in substance the proposal of his right hon. friend. The case really lay in a nutshell. They were all in favour of encouraging thrift; and the majority of the friendly societies were agreed that if the income received from them by members was included as income under the Bill thrift would be discouraged. If a man felt that his contributions to his society and the income which would result from these might deprive him of a pension he would be very likely to think it useless to save money in that way. The result of the Government scheme, as it stood, would therefore be to discourage that form of thrift which consisted in becoming a member of a friendly society. The only serious argument against the Amendment was that if they protected that kind of saving there was no reason why they should not protect other kinds. The answer was clear. Investment in a friendly society was the particular form of saving most prevalent among the people whom this Bill was intended to help; and the Amendment said that if a man saved in that way he should not be penalised. Further, the exception proposed depended on facts which could be readily ascertained, it involved no prying into a man's personal means, and if carried it would help the friendly societies. A similar provision had had the effect in New Zealand of very substantially increasing the membership of the friendly societies; and he felt that if the Amendment were not carried the membership of the friendly societies in the United Kingdom would be likely to go down. The Government were in some danger of putting a penalty on thrift which the Amendment would, to some extent, avoid, and he was sure the public would consider it a great improvement on the Bill.

Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) said he was very glad to hear the remarks made by hon. Gentlemen above the gangway in favour of old-age pensions, but he wondered how it was that they had not had an old-age pension scheme before them during the long years they were in office. Although they might regret the past, it was quite evident that when their friends were in power again they were going to have the very best scheme of old-age pensions ever heard of. All the same he felt that he must support the Amendment. As one who had been connected with friendly societies and a trade union all his mature life he believed there was some justification for the demand for the exemption of the income derived from them in calculating income for the receipt of an old-age pension. The right hon. Gentleman had said that if exemption was given to members of friendly societies, why not also give exemption to the income of a man in a small way of business or who had invested his savings in a house? There was all the difference in the world between the two cases. Take his own case. Before he could draw his superannuation allowance he had to pay into his society or trade union for forty years and could not in all that time make use of his money. But a man in a small way of business got the use of his money all the time. He did not profess to speak for the party to which he belonged, but only as an old member of a friendly society, and he thought the Government should as far as possible meet their views.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, on a point of order, said that the Amendment which was last put from the Chair was an Amendment to an Amendment dealing with friendly societies. It was very inconvenient to discuss friendly societies on an Amendment of a totally different character. His suggestion was that his words should be added to the Bill and that then they should discuss the whole subject. The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman was an extension to other forms of thrift.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked whether it was not common, even usual, and certainly favourable to debate, when an Amendment was moved to the original proposition, to discuss both the Amendment and the original proposition, so that the debate should cover the whole ground.

*The CHAIRMAN said that this was a matter in which he could meet the convenience of the Committee if he could find out what was desired. He had no objection to the Amendment to the Amendment being discussed with the original Amendment provided the decision was taken at the same time. [Cries of dissent.] If that did not meet with the convenience of the Committee they must take the strict course, and when they had decided upon the Amendment to the Amendment they could discuss whatever was left.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex Epping) asked whether it would be in order now to discuss the Amendment of his right hon. friend.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman wished to add certain other words. The first thing to be decided, if the Committee objected to discuss the two things together, was whether the words were to be added or not. If they were added, the whole thing could be discussed.

MR. GOULDING (Worcester) appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw his Amendment and let the Committee take a decision upon the great issue of trade unions and friendly societies, which many of them desired to see tacked on to the Bill.

MR. CHAPLIN said the answer to that appeal was that the Government had stated that as to the original Amendment moved there could be only one reply: that it could not possibly be accepted because then other societies would have to be added.

*MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) supported the appeal of his hon. friend that the right hon. Gentleman should withdraw his Amendment. He contended that the great friendly societies and trade unions were in a totally different category from the other organisations to which his right hon. friend had referred. The hold which the trade unions and great friendly societies had over the workmen of the country was that in making their contributions the workmen knew they were not only making contributions in their own interests, but that, side by side with the mutual provident arrangement for themselves, they were able to help their comrades in other directions. It was because his right hon. friend had placed these in the same category as the other forms of thrift that he objected to the Amendment. They ought not to be included with others of a selfish nature.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that, as he understood the matter, if his right hon. friend did not withdraw the Amendment it would be impossible to have a discussion on the real issue, the great friendly societies, and that, to many Members on both sides of the House, would be a matter of regret. He suggested, therefore, to his right hon. friend that he might bring up this separate proposition in a separate form. If the Committee permitted him to withdraw his Amendment now he could bring it up again on the Report stage. He therefore suggested that the Committee should allow his right hon friend to withdraw. [Cries of dissent.] He perceived that the House did not wish to take the discussion on the real issue. If that were the case two or three Members could prevent the discussion if they chose. If that course was taken, his right hon. friend, if he accepted the suggestion, should endeavour to have the two questions divided, so that the Committee might have an opportunity of discussing the other. The responsibility for failure would not rest with him, but with hon. Gentlemen opposite, and with the Government who raised obstacles when the Bill was recommitted. He suggested to his right hon. friend that he should throw the responsibility on the Committee for preventing a decision being taken on these two issues, and that he should now ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. CHAPLIN said he was most anxious to meet what appeared to meet the general view of the Committee, and, above all, the wishes of his right hon. friend. He might just repeat that he would never have dreamt of tacking his Amendment on to this if it had not been that all the methods of the procedure of the House had been upset. In these days they were driven to move Amendments in a totally different form from that in which they would have moved them if free speech had not been restricted. He had moved the Amendment in this form because he had no guarantee that if he did not move it now he would ever be able to move it at all. Under these circumstances he begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he was filled with admiration at the conduct of the right hon. Member for Wimbledon and his magnanimity in withdrawing his Amendment, not in deference to the opinion of his right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, but in deference to the appeal of his colleague the Member for tariff reform and Worcester. He was reluctant to intervene to emphasise the hon. Member's appeal, but the spectacle of the rift between Wimbledon and Worcester was simply heart-rending.

*MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) hoped the right hon. Member would not withdraw his Amendment. He himself was anxious to have the opportunity of supporting the Amendment. As a member of both a trade union and a friendly society he did not ask for a special privilege for these societies. There were hundreds of thousands of people in this country who had not the opportunity suggested in the first Amendment. There were thousands of women who never had the opportunity of joining a friendly society or trade union. What was the position? Two organisations or two methods of investment had become popular, especially among women. Where there was no opportunity of joining a trade union they put their money into a co-operative society, and when the small dividend accrued it was left to accumulate to make provision for their age. Were they to be debarred from the privilege enjoyed by a man with £3 a week who had joined a trade or friendly society? Another method of investment had been provided by some municipalities, who gave labouring men and women an opportunity of investing in the municipal funds by accepting small weekly sums. The Committee should be very careful not to make exceptions of people who could afford more, and he hoped they would vote on the Amendment, and take the test upon that point. In their zeal and energy to amend this their new friends on the Opposition Benches were deserving of support. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would stick to his guns. He had a good course in hand now.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) asked whether they ought not to have some reply from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and they would like to hear from the right hon. Gentleman's supporters whether or not they were in favour of the Amendment. It was quite clear that every one who had invested in the form stated would be disqualified, and therefore, it remained with hon. Members opposite to say whether or not they would accept the Amendment.

*MR. MADDISON (Burnley) said the right hon. Gentleman was under a misapprehension altogether. He said he wanted an answer. The hon. Member for Clitheroe had given him an answer. The Leader of the Opposition wanted a clear issue, but he could not have that unless the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon was passed. That was the whole point. The original Amendment confined itself to two points, and his hon. friend the Member for Clitheroe had shown that they could not have a clear issue until they had an Amendment which did not merely include two forms of thrift but all kindred forms of thrift. Just imagine the mute friends of friendly societies, these new-found enthusiasts for old-age pensions, these champions of thrift—[AN HON. MEMBER: We are as old as you are]—had actually forgotten the various forms of thrift, and their memory only took them to two until they were joined by the hon. Member for Clitheroe. Up and down the country there were tens of thousands of people who did not get into trade unions; but who invested their little savings in co-operative societies, and were still promoting the best interests of industry by so doing. If they were to have a clear issue they could not have the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon withdrawn.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the Committee was in rather a difficult position. The Government did not think it necessary to defend their attitude or to explain it. They left their case to be argued by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway on one side or the other. Hon. Members sitting around him on those benches had been attacked by the hon. Member for Burnley, who said that they were now interested for the first time in the subject of old-age pensions and friendly societies. There was not a shadow of foundation for the hon. Gentleman's statement, which it was difficult to criticise in Parliamentary language. Though the hon. Gentleman had offered some provocation by the language which he had employed, he would pass on to deal with what he had attempted in the way of argument. The hon. Member had said that they could not get a clear issue if they withdrew his right hon. friend's Amendment. He knew that the House was not going to allow his right hon. friend to withdraw it, but, if the House permitted him to do so, they could take a separate vote on the two propositions which were now before them. They could divide first on the Amendment of his hon. friend behind him, which confined the exemption to thrift which had taken the form of contributions to friendly societies and trade unions, and they could divide subsequently on the separate proposition which his right hon. friend the Member for Wimbledon was anxious to make. Was there any reason why a distinction should be made between these two kinds of thrift? The hon. Gentleman below the gangway and the hon. Gentleman opposite said there was none. But already the House had repeatedly made the distinction which his hon. friend the Member for Devonshire was now seeking to introduce. The distinction was embodied in the law of the country when they were dealing with the present Poor Law relief, and it was embodied in this Bill by the Amendment moved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day. As to the original Amendment the Government had announced that they would not accept that Amendment. His right hon. friend had moved the Amendment which made the ground of the argument of the First Commissioner of Works and of the two hon. Gentlemen opposite who had just spoken, that the original Amendment was limited and restricted, and that, therefore, they ought to take every form of thrift, whatever it might be. That was a perfectly reasonable proposition. It was one in regard to which there was a great deal to be said, and which was well worth arguing in that House. But was it because they might accept the proposal that the Government insisted on so amending the original Amendment that they refused the right to his right hon. friend to withdraw his proposal? No; it was because they could reject the whole Amendment as amended more easily than they could reject the original Amendment if it stood alone. And they were going to see Members of the Government and their followers go into the lobby in support of the proposition of his right hon. friend, not because they desired to accept it, but in order to deprive the House of an opportunity of voting on another Motion which they were actually unwilling to accept, but still more unable to resist.

*Mr. GOULDING said they had been repeatedly told by the Government that when any Amendment was moved extending the Bill, those moving it ought to put themselves in a position to state what their course was going to be. Now they had a right to ask the Government, who had all the machinery at their backs, what they estimated would be the cost of the extension which would be made to the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for Devonshire with the addition made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon. They wanted to know what was going to be the actual cost, because the First Commissioner of Works had made a bungle of the figures. The moderate Amendment of the hon. Member for Devonshire dealt with the specific cases of individuals who had exercised thrift and had saved the country hundreds and thousands of pounds in rates. The right hon. Gentleman had turned and said that he could not support this moderate proposal because the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon had extended the proposition by including a vast number of other people, and that the expenditure would consequently be too prodigious; therefore, he was going to ride off on that issue. The right hon. Gentleman was a keen campaigner in the country, but he did not think that the working classes would be led away by a mockery of that kind. The people of the country who had exercised thrift, and the friendly societies without exception, had asked that their efforts should be rewarded by the recognition of their right to the old-age pension. No amount of subterfuge or of talking on the Amendment of his right hon. friend would release the Government or hon. Members below the gangway from the charge of having deliberately ignored the unanimous request of the great friendly societies throughout the country. He had risen to ask a question to which he thought he had a right to a specific answer from the Government, and that was what was the accurate estimate of cost they made on the original Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for Devonshire.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member's speech is largely out of order. We have now only to consider whether these words are to be added. The hon. Member has no right to ask what will be the expense of the original Amendment.

MR. GOULDING: Am I not entitled to ask what is the estimated expenditure on the orignial Amendment, and what will be the total expenditure with the Amendment of my right hon. friend added to the original Amendment?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Strictly speaking, we are on the point as to adding these words, and the only question which arises is what is the extra cost of that addition.

MR. GOULDING: That is my request. What will be the total expenditure on the Amendment if amended by the addition of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon? I would like to point out to you that we are in this difficulty. The Government, through the First Commissioner of Works, distinctly stated in this House that inaccurate figures had been given with regard to the Amendment.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member cannot discuss that. We must settle this matter first. We cannot dispose of that question until we have settled this one.

MR. GOULDING: If the Amendment of my right hon. friend is added to that of my hon. friend the Member for Devonshire, shall we not then be in a position to get an accurate statement of the cost of the original Amendment, and am I not entitled to ask what is the cost of the joint Amendment?

*THE CHAIRMAN: Not now. That question might be asked later, but I have no means of enforcing an answer. It will be a perfectly relevant and proper question when we have settled whether these words should be added or not, whatever the result of the decision may be.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Committee might have imagined from the indignation of the last two speakers that this was some proposition of the Government. They would hardly believe that their anger was because the suggested words were moved by one of the leaders of the Opposition. This was not the Government's Amendment at all. It was the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon, and simply because it had been suggested that these words should not be withdrawn, but that they should be added, all the vials of the wrath of the Member for Worcester, of both the Members for Worcester, had been poured upon the Government. An Amendment was moved which sought to set up some sort of preference for two specific forms of thrift to the exclusion of others. Banks, building societies, co-operative societies—every form of thrift was to be discouraged except the two which were so near the hearts of hon. Members opposite.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I rise to order. I wish to ask whether, after your ruling, the Chancellor of the Exchequer is entitled to discuss the original Amendment.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer to be discussing the original Amendment.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was simply giving a plain narrative of the facts. That was the proposition. Then came his right hon. friend, who answered on behalf of the Government and pointed all this out—that it discouraged every other form of thrift. Then the logical mind of the right hon. Gentleman saw the force of that argument. He wanted to be fair and just—and justice was justice to all, not merely to those privileged communities which his hon. friend was so much in love with. He was convinced, and instantly moved an Amendment that included them all. That was the position. It was due to the logic of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon. Why should they be abused because the right hon. Gentleman had a clear and fair mind? Of course, they knew perfectly well why the Amendment was moved, and why all this indignation was expressed. It was because they thought they had got the Government in a hole, and it was in pursuance of the policy which had been pursued from the start of moving wild, illogical, irrational Amendments without any sense of responsibility, or any regard at all to the cost to the revenue, in order to be able to say to every class in turn, "We voted for you, and those wicked Radicals voted against you." All he could say was that it served them right, because it was purely a manœuvre. The right hon. Gentleman was exceedingly angry with the hon. Member for Burnley because, he said, he had rather taunted them with what they had done in the matter of old-age pensions. He would like to know what they had done, except to talk about them at bye-elections. That was the position. They were entirely responsible. If they were going to vote at all, let them vote for a clear principle. The noble Lord, he knew, was very anxious and eager to push these logical principles home, but he thought it would be a difficulty for the Government. Here was a test. Did he really say it was fair to discriminate in favour of trade unions against friendly societies and co-operative societies and every other form of thrift? Yet he would vote for it. Why? Not because he was a greater believer in trade unions than in other forms of thrift, but because it was putting the Radicals in a difficulty.

Lord R. CECIL: Why not?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the principles they were now called upon to vote for, thanks to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon, who had the courage of his convictions, and the hon. Baronet the Member for the City, who had so consistently supported the Government——

Sir F. BANBURY: May I point out that I voted with the right hon. Gentleman once to-day, twice yesterday, and I am going to vote with him on this Amendment as well?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was the sort of support that one liked to get. Now there was a clear and definite principle before the Committee, that every form of thrift, without any exception, and every saving should be exempted. The moment they added the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon to this proposition, he would be in a position to point out to the Committee what that really meant. But let them see clearly what they were voting for, and vote for some definite principle and not for a mutilated suggestion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said there was one advantage in closure by guillotine which he had never suspected before. It had given them the opportunity of hearing from the Minister in charge of the Bill the kind of speech and the kind of temper which those in charge of a Bill usually restrained from fear of prolonging debate, but which the right hon. Gentleman opposite knew he could indulge in with absolute impunity. It mattered not in the least how he stoked the fires of controversy; in fact, the more the debate was prolonged the better for him, and the fewer the difficulties in which the Government found themselves. His amazement at the performance they had just listened to was redoubled by the fact that unless his eyes wholly deceived him it was the same right hon. Gentleman who had just delivered an inflammatory oration who had asked him to move the closure on the debate ten minutes ago.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, I did not ask that.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he might have been mistaken. The right hon. Gentleman had got a passion for clear issues, and it was for that reason that he declined to have the first proposition put with regard to friendly societies and trade unions, and subsequently the Amendment of his right hon. friend. He was not content with explaining what he called his object. They all knew what was his object. He need not go through all those oratorical figures in order to disguise the result. But why should the right hon. Gentleman indulge in perfectly unfounded attacks upon the Opposition, following the example of less responsible persons on both sides of the House below the gangway? "Who are these people," said the right hon. Gentleman, "who now profess some regard for trade unions?" He would tell him who they were. They were the people who had passed all the best legislation for trade unions. [Cries of "The Trade Disputes Bill."] He said all the best legislation. Every Labour man in the House knew that what he was saying was correct. "Who are these people," the right hon. Gentleman went on to say, "who expressed this new-found regard for thrift?" Had they ever been behindhand in showing their interest in friendly societies and in helping thrift? A more foolish, inappropriate, untrue, and irrelevant charge never was brought by a Minister anxious to advance business before the House at a moment like that. And then as a climax the right hon. Gentleman, borrowing the thunder of two hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, said: "Who are these people who desire to extend the provisions of a pension scheme? They are the people who have never produced a pension scheme." It was perfectly true that since, largely under the guidance of his right hon. friend the Member for Birmingham, the pension question came to the front, during the remaining years of the Unionist Government no pension scheme was brought forward. They were perfectly aware that they had not the money to carry it out, and he presumed that for three years after they left office, hon. Gentlemen opposite had not the money to carry it out. If they had, why did not they do it? Why did they frame their Bill in terms which notoriously inflicted enormous hardship on people on the margin, if they had the money? Had they got the money now? He admitted he belonged to a party which did not bring forward schemes for old-age pensions which they had not the money to pay for. But why that should be dragged in to smooth the path of debate utterly surpassed his power of understanding. The simple facts of the case were these. There were two propositions with which the House was now concerned, the Amendment of his right hon. friend and the original Amendment. It would be, he thought, better if they could divide upon those two propositions separately. The Government, for obvious purposes of manœuvre, were determined to divide upon them together. They might have money—and let those who professed this wonderful friendship for the friendly societies note this—they probably had money to deal with the Amendment of his hon. friend behind him. They believed they had not money for the larger proposal of his right hon. friend. They were, therefore, determined to do nothing for the friendly societies, and they thought they could escape an obligation, which they could not escape if that proposition was dealt with alone, under cover of the financial difficulties which the larger proposition imposed on them. This new-born love of logical symmetry, which had never oppressed the Government at any previous stage of the Bill—this passion for driving every proposition to its extreme logical consequences—which now beset them, was really a plan for not making their money go as far as it would go. Let the friendly societies thoroughly understand the position. Apparently, the Government thought they had a case for saying it would not go the length of his hon. friend's proposition. The Government were determined to sacrifice the friendly societies upon the altar of logic; and upon the altar of logic alone they were prepared to deal a blow at the great friendly societies which under the pension scheme existing in New Zealand flourished. [Cries of "Order."] That was what the right hon. Gentleman was endeavouring to do. They had money enough for the members of friendly societies, but had not, or thought they had not, enough to go the whole length of the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon. The Chancellor of the Exchequer thought he could show that the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon involved such a great expenditure of money that the House would be forced to reject it. The refusal of the Government to allow these two questions to be voted upon separately was simply a dodge by which the interests of the friendly societies might be sacrificed under cover of the financial necessities of the country.

Mr. MILDMAY asked if he was in order in asking that the cost of his Amendment might be given. He thought they should have that information before they were asked to vote. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman merely as a matter of courtesy, and he could not see any reason why he should decline to accede to his request.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: How can I give an estimate in regard to an Amendment moved only an hour ago?

Amendment to the Amendment agreed to.

Question proposed, "That those words, as amended, be there inserted."

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the right hon. Gentleman had stated that he could not give them an estimate of the cost of the Amendment. Perhaps he could give them an estimate of the cost of the original Amendment. It was most important that they should have the correct figure, because the First Commissioner of Works had put it at £250,000, and he stated subsequently that he had made a mistake and had given the wrong figures. No doubt the Chancellor of the Exchequer had the right figures in his possession.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that he went through the Amendments with such information as he had at his disposal, and he had received an estimate from the Treasury. The Treasury estimated that the first Amendment would increase the number of pensioners by 100,000 people. That would make a very serious addition to the cost of the Act. It would mean another £1,300,000. But when he came to the addition that would be made by accepting the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon, the cost was absolutely prohibitive. The Amendment of that right hon. Gentleman was practically unlimited. It was estimated that some 400,000 people would come in under the ten-shilling test, and it would be a most moderate estimate to say that the Amendment as a whole now before the Committee meant an additional £2,600,000. Of course, he had to trust very largely to guesswork on the part of the officials. But he could not possibly accept the Amendment, either in its original form or in the more logical and equitable form in which it had been placed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon.

Mr. JOWETT (Bradford, W.) said it appeared to him to be a most reprehensible proceeding for a member of the Government to prevent a vote being taken on the more restricted issue, and himself compel the wider issue alone to be divided upon, knowing all the time that he did not intend to support the wider issue. The right hon. Gentleman had purposely taken that course in order to keep the other issue from being put. It had been alleged that the Amendments from the Labour Benches were not *bona fide*. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] He might say that the intentions of those present were *bona fide*, and they wished to support them with all the power they could bring to bear. With regard to the action of the hon. Member for Clitheroe, he understood that the hon. Member intended to vote for the wider issue now raised and not the narrow issue.

*The CHAIRMAN: I think we have now got beyond whether the wider or the narrower issue was to be taken.

Lord R. CECIL: Surely it was in order to give reasons why they should support the wider issue.

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member was dealing with the action of the Government on the Amendment which is settled.

Mr. JOWETT asked what else could he deal with. As a private Member he wished to protest against the way the business was being conducted. Surely they had a right to vote on any issue which was put before them, and he was now being deprived of that right by the action of the Government for the deliberate purpose of saving hon. Members opposite the trouble of going through the division lobby.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 113; Noes, 243. (Division List No. 149.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowerman, C. W.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hodge, John
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jowett, F. W.
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
O'Grady, J.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, James (Halifax)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Steadman, W. C.
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Mildmay and Mr. Hills.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashley, W. W.
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethel, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)

Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdae)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Linclon)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schawnn, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) moved an Amendment to provide that in the calculation of a person's means there should be excluded any sum not exceeding £26 5s. a year received from the Crown as a pension for services in the Imperial forces of the Crown. He said that the arguments which had been used that afternoon in support of other Amendments applied with equal force to this Amendment. Soldiers and sailors who were in receipt of pensions should not have those pensions taken into consideration when they were claiming old-age pensions. There were two special arguments in support of the Amendment which he wished to press on the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The first was that a soldier's pension was really part of his daily pay. He enlisted for a certain period at so much per day, and the State said to him that at the end of that period he would receive so much by way of pension for the rest of his life. He thought it was rather unfair to take into account in this connection the money which a soldier was entitled to receive in respect of services which he had rendered to the country. That was a strong argument in favour of the Amendment, but there was a stronger, and that was that every English man or woman, according to the views of every hon. Member, was entitled to a pension of 5s. a week at seventy years of age. What did the soldier or sailor do? He undertook the liability of meeting dangers and discomforts far in excess of those which the ordinary citizen had to face. He undertook to fight the battles of his country, to serve for long periods in unhealthy climates, to undergo irksome discipline, and to risk his life in the service of his country. Therefore, he was entitled, over and above what civilians were entitled to, to have some extra remuneration for those services which he rendered to the State. He imagined that under the Bill as it stood any pension which a soldier or sailor received for the loss of an arm or a leg in the service of his country would be taken into consideration in estimating whether he should have an old-age pension or not. That would really be a very hard case if he was to be debarred from receiving a portion, if not all, of the old-age pension which other citizens were entitled to receive. They were constantly hearing of soldiers and sailors going into the workhouse. This year a large sum of money had been raised privately to take old soldiers and sailors out of the workhouse. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not accept the Amendment in its entirety, he would urge him to give some indication that he would meet the case of the men who received extra pension in respect of the loss of an arm or a leg in the service of the country. At the present moment very great difficulty indeed was found in recruiting for the Army and Navy, and if it were made widely known throughout the country that a man who had served his country well would receive a money compensation for the loss of a limb and that the whole of the benefits would not be taken away when he reached seventy years of age, but that he would receive a pension of 5s. a week, it would not only remove a sense of injustice but would have a beneficial effect on recruiting. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'cash,' to insert the words 'excluding any sum not exceeding £26 5s. a year received from the Crown as a pension for services in the Imperial forces of the Crown.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the hon. Member had spoken as if this was a Bill to deprive old soldiers of an old-age pension. On the contrary, this Bill gave to those old soldiers, or a vast majority of them, the opportunity of receiving a pension of 5s. a week. There would not be many of them who would be excluded owing to having an income of 12s. a week. He had no desire to disparage the services of our soldiers and sailors, or the manner in which they risked their lives for the honour of the flag; but miners and sailors in the mercantile marine also risked and sometimes lost their lives in the service of their country. Fortunately the loss was the exception, and he hoped it would become more and more the exception.

MR. ASHLEY said that the miner's wages and the soldier's pay could not be compared. The miner was paid several times as much as the soldier or the sailor.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the soldier and the sailor were guaranteed their wages and, in certain cases, a pension throughout life; but he was not comparing the two cases at all. The miner was exposed to all sorts of accidents, but the State did not guarantee a pension to him for the rest of his life. He had always thought it a great scandal to this country that we should allow men who had fought on many a field of battle to die in the workhouse. He did not think that any Britisher could feel anything but a thrill of shame that the heroes of Balaclava, for instance, should be allowed to die in the workhouse. But this Bill would, at any rate, prevent that in the case of old soldiers in the future. There would be a guarantee of 5s. a week to the old soldier when he attained the age of seventy, in addition to his pension from the Army. Say that his pension was 1s. a day, that would be 7s. a week, and unless he received something from another source which made his income more than the limit, he would always get his old-age pension. He knew that there were cases of hardship, but while he would not for a moment disparage the services of the old soldier or sailor, it would be impossible for him to draw a distinction between him and the men who served the State in civilian occupations at the risk of their lives, such as miners, railway servants, and sailors in the mercantile marine, who had likewise to scramble for a renewal of their employment,it might be every six months, or who, if they met with an accident which disqualified them from work, secured in most cases only a little miserable allowance. Under these conditions he did not think he would be justified in accepting the Amendment.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he saw the difficulty in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was placed, but he did not think that in his speech the right hon. Gentleman had quite done justice to the old soldier or sailor of the Royal Navy. He would put to the right hon. Gentleman two considerations which he had entirely omitted from his view. The right hon. Gentleman had talked about the heavy casualties which certain trades involved, and had quoted as illustrations miners and seamen of the mercantile marine. But the State had provided in these cases that a man should receive compensation for injury, or that his relatives should receive compensation for his death caused by such injury. Soldiers and sailors in the service of the Crown were, however, excluded from the provision which Parliament had thought necessary to make for civilians in such events. Again, did not the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself feel that the State owed something to those who worked directly for it? Parliament had already recognised higher obligations to those whose services had done something useful during their life-time to the country.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Those pensions were granted for special services.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Quite so; but that destroyed the Chancellor of the Exchequer's contention that there was no distinction to be drawn between the members of the military and naval forces of the Crown and civilians, like miners and sailors of the mercantile marine, who ran equal risks and served the State indirectly in private employment. He was sorry that in connection with this Bill they could not do something special for those who served the State in the forces of the Crown, either in the way proposed by his hon. friend, or, as he should have preferred, in the direction of making the old-age pensions awardable to such people rather higher than those who had given no direct service to the State. This was not a matter on which he felt he could, under the circumstances, press the Government very hard; but he could not pass the Chancellor of the Exchequer's observations without saying that they had already recognised higher obligations to those who served the State directly than to those who served the State indirectly.

Captain CRAIG wished to add to the appeal made by his hon. friend in favour of something being done, no matter how little, to differentiate between the ordinary classes of working men who reached the age of seventy, and those who served in the Army, Navy, and Marine Forces of the Crown. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that he did not wish to draw any unfair comparison between those who served their country directly, and those who served their country indirectly. But it seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman was making an unfair comparison between them all the time. The right hon. Gentleman's point was that miners accepted their employment on certain conditions, but these conditions generally were very favourable, because they received a higher rate of wages than any other class in the community, and they had therefore a chance of putting by money, or joining friendly societies. But in the case of soldiers and sailors serving with the colours, they were unable to put by for their old age. In the case of those who were recompensed after they had retired, that was not because they were destitute, but because a certain amount of pay was withheld from them during their service. Very few firms in civil life stopped from their men pay which they gave back in the shape of a money grant or bonus when the men left their employ. If the hon. Member carried the Amendment he would be the best recruiting officer in the kingdom, because if those who desired to join the military or naval forces knew that compensation for injuires received in active service would not be taken into consideration as part of their income for the old-age pension, a better class of men would come forward. If these words were added in favour of those who had performed a service for the country it would not only be a great incentive for them to join the colours or the Navy, but have a very material effect on those who had joined. He did not think the comparison made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer between the men in the mercantile marine and the men in the Navy was a good one. The services were vastly different. The right hon. Member had said that the former had to scramble for existence, but, as a matter of fact, they had a choice which did not exist in the Navy. In the Navy a man was always under the command of the officers; but in the mercantile marine, if after a voyage, a man did not like his ship, he could choose another. The right hon. Gentleman's objection to the Amendment was the same as his objection to many others. It was that he was unable to say what the cost would be, but in this case it would be very slight, and in any case a slight modification of the sugar duties would provide the funds. One-tenth of the £3,500,000 in question there would be sufficient to provide for the Amendment. The Government seemed to be afraid to make any exception whatever. All who had spoken from the Treasury Bench had said it was better to make no exception in this matter of calculating the means of those who were to receive a pension. But even from that standpoint a gracious concession on the part of the Government to this particular class would have a very great effect in the country. If the right hon. Gentleman now representing the Government took the responsibility of accepting the Amendment, which he was quite able to do, he was sure his action would meet with the highest approval of the great bulk of the community.

LORD BALCARRES thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had really missed the point of the Amendment. He had compared the soldier and the sailor with the ordinary artisan, the man in the coal-pit and the factory, and the sailor in the mercantile marine, and had said that they had an equally good claim as had the soldier and the sailor. With that, however, he could not agree. If a man in a civil occupation lost his life, his heirs received a very substantial sum under the Compensation Acts. No such benefit was reaped by the relatives of a soldier or a sailor who lost his life in the service of the country. That in itself entirely vitiated the simile of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. A still more cogent argument missed by the right hon. Gentleman was that these pensions were not pensions in the sense that an artisan received a pension from a man who had employed him for many years. Ninety per cent. of these pensions was deferred pay. The ordinary soldier was compelled to submit to a certain reduction of his daily pay for the purposes of the pension that was given to him, and the fact that he received deferred pay at the end of his life entitled him to be included in the category of thrifty, just as much as the man who derived his deferred pay from a friendly society. When the right hon. Gentleman said that a soldier, because he had 1s. a day, was to have a reduced pension, he was unjust, because that man was only getting the money he had earned, which he would have earned, and could have spent, had he been in a civil occupation. It was an error to suppose that all soldiers received only 1s. a day pension, and would receive 5s. a week later on. There were a large number of non-commissioned officers and soldiers who had special compensation for disablement and wounds who received the sum mentioned in the Amendment. If this pension was of right a reward for services rendered to the community, then he submitted that these soldiers and sailors had served the community just as much as the man who had been in a civil avocation. He could not understand why this Amendment was refused, unless it was the serious underlying cost.

MR. ASHLEY said that now the First Lord of the Admiralty was present he wished to put a particular point before him, as he was the person responsible for the Navy. He could conceive the Government refusing to accept his Amendment in its entirety for the reason given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which was that if he accepted it it would be difficult to refuse other Amendments. He did not agree with it, but he accepted that statement. But a great hardship was entailed on the man who received a weekly sum of money because he had lost a limb or had been incapacitated by wounds received in the service of his country. A man who had lost his leg in the Crimea would be arriving at the age when he would receive a pension under this Bill. But he was to get no advantage out of the money he received from the Government for his wound. That was to be taken into consideration by the Excise officer in allocating the pension. It was very hard that he should not have the old-age pension in addition to the amount received from the Government for the loss of a limb.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.) said the scheme of old-age pensions was for those who were unprovided for, and that was the Answer to that Question.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 68; Noes, 278. (Division List No. 150.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt.Hn.Sir AlexF.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J.A. (Worc.
Coates, Major E.F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J. (Birm'gham)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Lloyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Guinness, Walter Edward
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin, S.
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
McCalmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt.Hon.C.B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ashley and Captain Craig.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John

Barlow, Sir John E.(Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell,T.R. (Essex,Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Rt Hn SirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt,Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur Duncan
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris,T. H. W.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J M(FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
McCallum, John M.
McCrae, George
McKenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
McLaren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
McMicking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G.Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan Patrick A.(Queen's Co.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C. (Kincard
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J..
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, D.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central
Price, Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robinson, S.
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)

Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampt'n
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he rose to move an Amendment of which he had given notice earlier and which would place him in the peculiar position of making a proposition which would be accepted by the Government. He was sorry neither the Prime Minister nor the Chancellor of the Exchequer, both of whom were present at the earlier portion of the debate, was present now. He moved to exclude from the purview of the pension committee "any sums payable as a premium of insurance against sickness, death, or funeral expenses." The Amendment arose out of a discussion they had at the beginning of the afternoon on what constituted income. In rejecting the proposal to add the word "net" before "income," the Prime Minister, answering a point raised by the hon. Member for Leicester, said that any premium paid by workmen for insurance against death would not be considered as part of a man's income for the purpose of this section. He based that argument upon the analogy of the reduction allowed for life insurance from income for the purpose of Income-Tax Assessment. Personally, he did not think the analogy of the Income-Tax Act could be imported into this Act because the Income-Tax Act had that exception under special statutory provision, which was not repeated in this Act. The most that could be said against that part of his proposal was that it was not necessary, but the Prime Minister would not and could not contend that the analogy of the Income-Tax Act could be extended to that large and more common case of the payment of some little weekly premium in order to ensure the person against sickness or to cover funeral expenses. He said that it was the intention of the Government to exclude all those payments, and he (Mr. Chamberlain) therefore moved to put into the statute what was the intention of the Government.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'excluding,' to insert the words 'any sums payable as a premium of insurance against sickness, death, or funeral expenses, etc.'"—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed be there inserted."

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said he was sorry to disagree with the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman. It was impossible for the Government to accept the Amendment. If this particular form of exception were included in the Bill the result would be to exclude from the consideration of the pension committees any other expenditure of a similar kind which ought properly to be taken into account and deducted from the total income of the recipient. There was, also, a particular objection to the words of the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment on their merits. Take the case of a man who paid 3s., which was only a moderate sum, for insurance against death, funeral expenses and sickness.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That is a man of seventy who has just joined. I am talking of a man who had done it all along.

MR. McKENNA said an applicant who had for a long period of time insured against death had an asset of very considerable value—a realisable asset—and his case was certainly not one of hardship which should be dealt with under the Bill. He was a possessor of property. The realisable value at the age of seventy of an insurance against death in any insurance office was considerable.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. He is giving a new interpretation to the clause. Does he mean that a policy of insurance against death, being, as he said, valuable property, is such property as was contemplated in subsection (*c*) as might bring in yearly income and would, therefore, have to be taken into account?

MR. McKENNA said he was not at the moment saying anything which had any relation to subsection (*c*), because they were not discussing subsection (*c*). Doubtless the right hon. Gentleman would be able to raise that point on subsection (*c*) and ask whether that would be an item of property, and no doubt his ingenuity would enable him to suggest many other difficult questions as to what did and what did not constitute property. But dealing with this particular Amendment, the case of the old applicant who must have at least 15s., was not a case calling for the special commiseration of the Committee, and they could not make reductions whereby he would be entitled to an additional 5s. An old applicant earning 15s. a week and paying so much for insurance, if he lost his power of earning through sickness, would instantly receive a pension.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No. It must be calculated on his income for the year.

MR. McKENNA said the Bill did not say that, except in the absence of other means of ascertaining the income. If he was able to obtain an income of over 15s. a week for the whole year he was not properly a subject, under the limitations of the present Bill, to receive a pension. The right hon. Gentleman was asking that these pensions should be given to a class of persons who were much better off than many people who were excluded, and it brought them always back again to the same question that where they had a limited amount of money it was not fair to spend it upon persons who were less proper claimants, when they necessarily excluded those who had a greater claim. On these two grounds, that these words would be a direction to the pension committees which would exclude their power of making allowances in every case where allowances ought properly to be made, and that they affected a class of persons who, *prima facie*, ought not to receive pensions when others were necessarily excluded, he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed further.

*MR. GOULDING said that during the whole of these discussions he had never heard such an extraordinary answer given to a reasonable proposal. The right hon. Gentleman spoke as if he had never had any access at all to friendly societies, and knew nothing about the class of men who joined them. He started with a person with 15s. a week, who would be excluded, in the first place, and then said he would be paying 3s. a week to a sick and death fund in a friendly society. To add to his ignorance of the whole thing, he said that this asset the individual could put up for sale by auction. It was a farce to treat the whole proposal in that way. Everyone knew perfectly well that when payments were discontinued the whole asset went back to the institution.

MR. McKENNA: This is not limited to friendly societies.

*MR. GOULDING said the right hon. Gentleman was playing with words. The class of persons who came under the Bill were not those who joined the great insurance companies that the right hon. Gentleman would join. They were talking of the insurance and friendly and thrift societies which were accessible to these individuals in the villages and towns with which they were connected. All these cases were of people who had contributed against sickness and death for years before they reached the age of seventy. He would like the right hon. Gentleman to quote any case of an individual of seventy years of age joining a friendly society for the first time for sickness and for death insurance. The right hon. Gentleman had not treated this case at all fairly. Early in the evening an Amendment was moved from his own side of the House to insert "net" income. They were told that was too vague and uncertain, and would not be understood. Now his right hon. friend had picked out words which actually met and covered the identical case they were asking to meet, namely, that of individuals who had done everything in their power in the exercise of thrift so as to provide against sickness and death, and that the contributions they had made should be deducted and should not be classed as income. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give some further answer. He had not touched at all the question of the sliding scale which had practically been adopted, though whether a pensioner was placed in the 1s., 2s., 3s., 4s., or 5s. category depended on whether such a policy was accounted an asset. Unless they got some satisfactory answer he hoped his right hon. friend would go to a division.

Captain CRAIG said he would like to deal with another aspect of the case. His hon. friend had treated it from the point of view of the smaller friendly society and insurance company, but he would like to meet the First Lord of the Admiralty on his own ground, because, as far as he could see, unless some such words as these were inserted in the section, it simply meant that every policy-holder would have to surrender his policy immediately the Bill came into force if he wished to benefit, because if a man had insured his life in one of the larger insurance companies and had paid premiums during the last thirty or forty years the Commissioners would immediately say: "I understand you have a policy on your life for £400. It is true you began when a boy, and only pay a small premium, but the value is £300 and we must put 4 per cent. on that, and deduct it from the amount on which your pension is to be calculated." A more sorrowful state of things could not exist. The right hon. Gentleman said the Government had not the funds, and it would be far better if he had given that as his excuse rather than entered into details which did not hold water at all from any business point of view. If he had said his instructions from the Chancellor of the Exchequer——

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has already referred to that on previous Amendments, and we are dealing here simply with the question of premiums on insurance.

Captain CRAIG said he would immediately stop, only they had different Cabinet Ministers in charge of the Bill at every step they took, and, not only that, but they had had different explanations of this particular clause from every Minister who took charge of it.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, but the hon. Member must remember that we are not dealing with the clause but with the Amendment.

Captain CRAIG said he had almost finished. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman's explanation was at all satisfactory, and if his right hon. friend went to a division he should certainly follow him.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that after the announcement of the First Lord he must take a division. He was not wedded to his own words if the same result could be attained by other words which pleased the Government better, or if the Government gave a distinct promise that under the regulations which they had to frame this point should be covered. But the First Lord of the Admiralty refused to enter on its merits but merely on the words. If he meant that he would accept other words he did not say so.

Mr. McKENNA: No, I cannot say I will accept other words until I see them, but I say on the merits of these words, which are not in the least confined to friendly societies but cover all cases of insurance by any person in any society, that their acceptance could not be considered. I gave another ground for non-acceptance of these or similar words that they would be binding on the pension committee.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN doubted whether they would prevent the committee from making allowances which they certainly ought to make. They had discussed certain allowances which they ought to make on the question of net income, and these it was explained by the Prime Minister were not income at all. The outgoings on cottage property, for instance, were no part of the income from cottage property. If the Bill was left as it stood it would not be within the discretion of the pension authority to exclude those payments from their consideration of a man's means. That was quite clear. When a Government saw that a good point was raised, and they wished to meet it, although they were unable to accept the particular form of words, the usual course was for the Government to undertake to bring up words of their own, framed after consultation with the Government draughtsman. The right hon. Gentleman had said that these words were impossible, but he might produce as many possible alternatives as he liked, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would always say that he had no skill in drafting, and, therefore, he could not accept those alternatives. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that he was pleading for something more to be given to the people who must be comparatively well off, and on that ground he had objected to his Amendment. Now what was the proposal? It was simply what the Prime Minister himself had declared to be the intention of the Government. He did not want to be disagreeable to Ministers who were satisfying the needs of humanity, but it was intolerable that the First Lord of the Admiralty should come down now when the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer were temporarily absent, and not having heard what the Prime Minister had said earlier in the debate, practically rule out what the Prime Minister had deliberately stated was the intention of the Government. He, therefore, appealed to the Government to carry out the declared intention of the Government as expressed by the Prime Minister. He put it to the Solicitor-General that if he meant to be helpful he could go to the Government draughtsman and get words which would carry out the intention without the objections to which it was said the Amendment was open. He appealed to the Solicitor-General who was present when the Prime Minister spoke earlier in the evening to confirm the statement he had made.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir S. EVANS, Glamorganshire, Mid.) thought the right hon. Gentleman would not be serving his purpose well by pressing for the inclusion of these words, because by a maxim well known to the law if they included one exception of this kind it would be the only exception they could make. He understood the Prime Minister to say that in his view in arriving at a man's income, premiums of this kind would be deducted on the analogy of the income-tax provisions. The danger of the Amendment would be that the pension society would be instructed that they must make this one deduction and that would exclude them from making any other deductions. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not press this Amendment to a division.

SIR E. CARSON said that in some respects the speech of the Solicitor-General was entirely satisfactory. If he could agree with him that the Bill allowed the deductions spoken of, then he thought the answer would be satisfactory. He could not see, however, where the Solicitor-General founded the right to allow these deductions in the words of the Bill. The Government said that this was to be excluded from the calculation of income, but they refused to put it in the Bill. Was that not a very small matter? What they had arrived at was that in calculating an income under the Bill they were to deduct this contribution for insurance against sickness and for funeral expenses, and why on earth should they not be able to put that into the Bill? That was all they asked for. Did the Solicitor-General mean to tell them that the resources of drafting were not equal to putting in a proviso allowing this deduction, and at the same time allowing other matters to be deducted which ought to be deducted. He was not a draughtsman, but he knew there were many Acts of Parliament which gave them a lead in the Act. He suggested that the Amendment should read "excluding among other matters." Any person acquainted with the consideration of statutes would then see that it had an indication that not only were they to deduct premiums for insurance and funeral expenses, but any other matter of a like character that ought to be deducted. The matter was perfectly plain and simple. If they wanted to give a lead to this great Imperial officer who was to be a kind of appellant tribunal from the Law Officers and everybody else, then they should accept his suggestion. There was another objection which the First Lord of the Admiralty made to this proposal. He said that the words proposed by his right hon. friend were too wide, and were not confined to friendly societies. Only about an hour ago they had almost a scene in the House because something was too narrow. It would be far better for the Government to be candid and honest with the House of Commons and tell them plainly that they did not mean these things to be deducted. It would be far better for the Government to say: "We have only got a certain amount of money for the purposes of the Bill. We have never thought over all these difficulties, and we must stick to the Bill." Right hon. Gentlemen knew perfectly well that if they wanted to make these matters clear on the face of the Bill, they could do so in five minutes by consulting the draughtsman.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that in order to meet the difficulty he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment in order to move it in a new form.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 7, after the word 'excluding' to insert the words 'among other matters any sums payable as a premium of insurance against sickness, death, funeral expenses, and.'"—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir E. Carson.

Mr. RAWLINSON said that nobody who read the subsection could doubt that insurance premiums would not be deducted from a man's income. The word "income" had been continually defined in legal matters as the amount of money that came into a person's pocket. Could anybody say that a man's income was so much a year unless there was a provision in the Bill allowing him to deduct the payments made for premiums against sickness or death? He ventured to say that the Bill would be unworkable without such a provision. If that was so, surely, if the Government meant these deductions to be made, words ought to be inserted in the Bill to that effect. He expressed no opinion as to whether these deductions should be made or not. All he wanted to make clear was that unless these words were put in, no pension officer would have the slightest right to make these deductions.

Mr. JAMES HOPE said it was clear from what his hon. and learned friend had said that on the words of the Bill no deductions could be made in respect of payments of insurance premiums. He was a layman, and he did not wish to go deeply into the question, for the contest in this matter was between two lawyers, but he thought the Solicitor-General might attempt to reply to his hon. and learned friend. There was obviously doubt and difficulty in the matter. The whole Committee were agreed that what they wanted to understand was what was the actual income which a man possessed, and which he was able to dispose of from week to week. When he suggested that the word "available" might be inserted the Solicitor-General was dumb on that point. In last Parliament when sitting in Opposition the hon and learned Gentleman was never wanting in arguments on any point.

*The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. Member speak to the Amendment?

Mr. JAMES HOPE said there was doubt as to the meaning of the words in the Bill. The Committee appeared to be unanimous that income should be clear available income for the purpose of week to week payments. In view of that doubt, and of the fact that this matter could not be brought up on Report, he asked the Postmaster-General, the senior Minister present, to give an assurance that the first subsection which dealt with money matters would be considered on the recommittal of the Bill.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) asked whether the pension committee would have to define what income was, or whether there would be a standard by which they would define what income was.

Mr. McKENNA said it would be for the pension committee to define what income was.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 83; Noes, 298. (Division List No. 151.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm'gham)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt Hon. Sir John H.
Kerry Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt. Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras, W.
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H. (Suss'x, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph

Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert

Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.)
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)

Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas

Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) moved as an Amendment to substitute the word "receivable" for the word "payable" in the first subsection of the clause. He did so in order to make sense of the subsection and probably carry out what was intended, because it was obvious that the persons mentioned in the subsection would receive and not pay any sum on account of an old-age pension under the Bill. It was quite clear that a mistake had been made in regard to the word.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 8, to leave out the word 'payable,' and insert the word 'receivable.'"—(*Mr. W. Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'payable' stand part of the clause."

Mr. L. HARCOURT said it might be interesting to the hon. Gentleman if he pointed out that a sum receivable by one man must be obviously payable by another. He saw no objection to the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Captain CRAIG moved an Amendment providing that account should be taken of the "average" income received. He thought that the subsection (*b*) as it stood would in some cases act rather unfairly. Suppose that owing to the receipt by a pensioner of a small windfall in one year, and perhaps the promise that something would be done for him the next year, the position of the pensioner might be endangered, and unless the word "average" was inserted he might be barred from receiving a pension altogether. The Attorney-General had said that a gift from an unexpected source would not be considered as part of a man's income, but that did not appear in the Bill, and the pensions committee might not give that interpretation to income in the case of a windfall in any one year, say, of £40. The pensioner would be protected from forfeiture of his pension if the income was averaged over three years, as in the case of the Income-Tax Returns. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 11, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'average.'"—(*Captain Craig.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'average' be there inserted."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the hon. Member had not put this Amendment on the Paper, and had certainly not thought it out. Supposing an old man who had been working for two and a half years earning fairly good wages suddenly broke down. He could come before the pensions committee and plead that he had earned nothing for that year, and would receive a pension. But if his earnings were to be averaged on the previous three years income he would be excluded from a pension. He could not accept the Amendment.

Captain CRAIG said he quite admitted that it would cut both ways, but he thought it would soften the hardship in many cases if the average of three years was taken.

Amendment negatived.

*Mr. SMEATON moved to leave out subsection (*c*) of the clause, which refers to the account to be taken of the yearly income which might be expected to be derived from any property belonging to the person which, though capable of investment or profitable use, is not so invested or profitably used by him. The subsection seemed expressly designed to decrease the rapidly diminishing number of pensioners and to make a trap into which they might fall. It made pensions dependent on hypothetical profits which were to come from nebulous property. He could imagine persons who had an old horse which was past work and was pensioned off being asked by the pension officer why they did not put him to work.

Or a man might have a small shop in which a cheap class of articles was sold, and the pension officer arriving at a hypothetical income on the basis that if he charged more for his goods, the man would make a better income. Or, when an aged pair had had a little cottage given them by their children or grandchildren, in which to live during their declining years the pension officer might come and say "Why don't you let that cottage at a good rent and you live elsewhere?" In such cases the pension officer could make the income practically what he liked. He urged the Committee to wipe the sub-clause out altogether; it was not a sub-clause that did credit to the Government.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 16, to leave out subsection (*c*)."—(*Mr. Smeaton.*)

Question proposed, "That subsection (*c*) stand part of the clause."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said his hon. friend imagined every conceivable use for this subsection, except the one for which it was intended, and he should have thought obviously intended. The illustration of an old horse was rather a remote one. He did not think that that horse could be invested in such a way as to make a great income. The illustration of the shop, too, was almost ludicrous. The clause was intended to get at the man who hoarded up his money in an old stocking instead of investing it. A man who did that in preference to investing it, he thought, ought not to come in for an old-age pension. That was a case that had constantly to be dealt with now by boards of guardians. If he could discover that, the pension officer was quite right to say: "You are not the sort of person who should have a pension."

Mr. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) regretted extremely that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had used that argument. There was not a shadow of proof that a board of guardians had ever refused relief because the man to be relieved had hoarded money.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: They could take the money.

Mr. WALTER LONG said they did so after they had granted the relief. But the pension officer was going to refuse a pension on that ground. The power was to be exercised, not by elected local bodies, not even by the pension committee, but by the pension officer, who was to be an Imperial officer, not subject to the control of the local authority, but to the control of another Imperial officer. The whole of the investigations into a man's means were to be made by what was somewhat euphemistically called an Imperial officer. He was a revenue officer, and a man whose business it was to get blood out of a stone if possible. He was the man whom the Government was going to charge with the duty of ascertaining whether applicants for pensions had hoarded away sums of money. He doubted very much indeed whether the words of the clause would carry out the intention of the Government. Of course, if they did not, when they came to them, the Government, after the declarations made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, would be compelled to amend them. The pension committee, therefore, would be a sort of fraud, simply existing to carry out the directions of the pension officer. No pension could be granted under subsection (*c*) unless the pension officer was satisfied the man had not hoarded away some source of income. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had quoted the boards of guardians, and referred to the case most familiar and most difficult of all. Under the law as it stood, a board of guardians could only relieve a man if he proved to be destitute. There were many cases where a man in his better days had invested his savings in purchasing the house in which he lived. That house was letable and had a rental value. If the board of guardians administered the law as it stood, they ought to call upon that man to get rid of his property before they gave him relief. Some boards did this, but others did not, and the Local Government Board never, so far as he knew, interfered, although they did not carry out the letter of the law. These cases would occur over and over again. Would the Excise officer say to a man: "You have no right to a pension, because you have a cottage which you should rent to somebody else?" If this inquiry were not to be made, the subsection ought not to be put in the Bill. It was perfectly clear that this was on all fours with the law which governed boards of guardians, and which in some cases they carried out. The Government might have other intentions, but that had nothing to do with an Act of Parliament. The pension officer and the pension committee would have to carry out the Act regardless altogether of the intentions of the Government, and if this subsection were in the Act, Excise officers could come down on the man who applied for a pension and who had saved enough money to buy the cottage in which he lived. In hundreds of villages near towns cottages could be let at rents far higher than those paid by the cottagers. Did this subsection mean that the Excise officer was to go to a man who owned a cottage and say: "You charge yourself the local rent, £3 10s. a year, but if you choose to let your cottage to an artisan out of the town, you can get £10 or £15 per year; why do not you do it?" The man had, perhaps, lived there all his life, all his children had been born there, and he wanted to live there till he died, and he had no means besides the cottage. If the subsection stood, and it was interpreted as other similar sections, the Excise officer would be compelled to say: "Until you realise your property and turn it to the best use, you are not eligible." He could not understand why the Government adhered to the subsection. What good was it going to do? The Chancellor of the Exchequer said there were men who had hoarded money. There were, of course, cases here and there, but they were isolated cases, and they might very well be neglected. Boards of guardians in such cases where they gave relief under the Poor Law were able to recover the cost of the maintenance of the individuals. He hoped the Government, in order to catch these few cases, were not going to impose a duty on the pension officer which, if he carried it out, would result in great hardship upon some of the most deserving. He did not believe they would save money. He regarded the subsection as mischievous and dangerous.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS said there were thousands of old couples who had things in their cottages which, if they sold them, would realise £20, £30, £40, or £50. Any collectors would give these sums for them; but owing to their associations the old people would not part with them as long as they lived. Were these things to be capitalised and the interest taken into account before the old people were given their pension? They would find, for instance, an old clock, perhaps a hundred years old, for which collectors would give more and more money, or an old brass warming pan for which collectors in America and England would give £10 People would even give a good deal for old brass candlesticks, which originally cost perhaps 1s. In some cottages there was old china and many other things. A few months ago he was in a cottage in Devonshire, and there were things there which would realise £50 or £60 at least. Were they going, like an auctioneer, to appraise the saleable value of these things, and say to these poor women: "You might invest that for profitable use and if you do not we shall charge you so much per cent. on the capitalised value and reckon that as your income." He thought the Government had better leave that out altogether. He asked them not to inflict this hardship.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that this was a sample of the hypercriticism to which the Bill was subjected. Every conceivable case of possible hardship was first imagined, and then exaggerated a hundredfold. His right hon. friend conceived the case of a pension officer—a kind of Shylock—who went into a poor man's cottage and told him he had to sell a piece of furniture which had come down to him from his great-grandfather.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS: He is directed to do it by the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked the Members for Birmingham kindly to restrain themselves till he had finished. First of all this officer who was responsible to the House went scouring like an ogre through the country, visiting every little hovel and cottage, and said: "Sell out this valuable warming-pan;

no pension for you." Would hon. Gentlemen mind looking at the Bill? He was very glad the necessity for that had dawned on Gentleman opposite. This was simply a proposal which was in the most liberal scheme that had ever been devised for old-age pensions. [Ironical OPPOSITION cheers.] Had hon. Members any notion what scheme that was? He was referring to New Zealand. They were cheering something else. In the New Zealand scheme they reckoned capital. The Government did not go as far as that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Only up to £150.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. Member really was not relevant in his interruption. Before a man could be excluded under this provision it must be proved that he had got, not a grandfather's clock which he could sell for £10, but at least £850.

MR. WALTER LONG: Why?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was amazed at the right hon. Gentleman asking why. For the simple reason that his capital must be such as would produce 8s. a week, and all the Amendments put on the paper suggesting that they were going to compel the labourer to sell every stick of his furniture were not fair to the Committee or to the country. Did the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin mean to tell him that the guardians, if they knew a man had £850 with property, which would produce in any reasonable investment £20 16s.——

MR. WALTER LONG: That is not in the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It is.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No, it is not.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Will the right hon. Gentleman mind telling me what he means?

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must ask the Committee to allow the Chancellor of the Exchequer to proceed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that Questions had been put to him by two right hon. Gentlemen, and he thought he was only acting civilly in responding. He had sat down to enable the right hon. Gentleman opposite to tell him in what respects he had misrepresented him.

MR. WALTER LONG said the intervention of the Chair had made it impossible. The Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement was that there must be capital producing the gross income he had mentioned. He denied that, and he denied it still. The income fixed by the Bill might be derivable from several sources. Assuming that a man had a grant of 9s. a week, of which there were thousands of cases, from any particular source, especially from an employer, did the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that the hoarded property would have to be £850? Two shillings a week or less than the estimated rental of a cottage would bring him over the margin.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that now the right hon. Gentleman had shifted his ground. It was not hoarding property at all, but income derived from other sources.

And, it being half-past Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 17th June, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That subsection (*c*) stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 327; Noes, 111. (Division List No. 152.)

AYES

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,Sir John E.(Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Roland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H. (Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell,T.R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,Rt HnSirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifin)
Davies,M.Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder,Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirW.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,Rt.Hn L.(Rossendale
Harcourt,Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Col.Sir Ivor(Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G. (Fife, West)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever,W. H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
McCallum, John M.
McCrae, George
McLaren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
McMicking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C. (Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nichols, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Col.Ivor (S'thamp'tn)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.

Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell, (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, F. (Wolverhampton)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H(Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampt'n
Tompkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmann'n
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, RtHn SirAlex.F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, RtHn. A.J.(CityLond.)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G(Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHnJ.A.(Worc.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E.F.(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Jowett, F. W.
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M‘Arthur, Charles
M‘Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Grady, J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J.G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)

Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. George D. Faber.

The Chairman then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, and on any Questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 22, to leave out from the second word 'of,' to the end of line 25, and to insert the words 'a married couple living together in the same house, the means shall not in any case be taken to be a less amount than half the total means of the couple.'"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): On a point of order, I desire to say that the Amendment which you have put from the Chair is an Amendment of which notice has not been given.

***The CHAIRMAN**: Notice has been given, but it is not correctly put on the Paper as to form.†

Mr. BOWLES again rose to order, but as the Chairman also remained standing the hon. Member could not be heard amid the cries of "Order" and "Sit down."

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Emmott, will you inform the Committee what is the Question which you have just put and which we could not hear? I understand it is not the Amendment as it appears upon the Notice Paper.

***The CHAIRMAN**: The question I have to put is Clause 4, line 22, to leave out from the second "of" to end of line 25, and insert "a married couple living together in the same house the means shall not in any case be taken to be a less amount than half the total means of the couple." What the Government propose is on the Paper. They put in a new subsection and eliminate subsection 2. In the new subsection which they propose they use several of the initial words of subsection 2, and therefore the correct form is as I have put it.

Lord R. CECIL: On a point of order. The words of the guillotine Resolution are perfectly clear. They are that the only Amendments which can be put are Amendments moved by the Government "of which notice has been given."

***The CHAIRMAN**: The question has been put.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: On the point of order, may I call your attention to the words immediately succeeding those which have just been quoted by my noble friend? They are that "but no other Amendments."

***The CHAIRMAN**: The Amendment which I have put is an Amendment of which notice has been given. [Cries of "No" and "Yes."]

The Committee divided—

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said: Mr. Emmott, I call your attention to the fact that the doors were locked in the "No" lobby, while the Members were still being permitted to go into the other Lobby. [Loud cries from the Opposition Benches of "Farce, farce."]

***The CHAIRMAN** said the doors could not be closed immediately if it was blocked with Members.

As the Tellers were advancing to the Table after the division—

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I desire to call your attention to a fact on which I should like to have your ruling, and I ask you if it does not upset the division which has just been taken. When you gave your order for the doors to be shut your order was obeyed for the "No" lobby, but not obeyed with regard to the "Aye" lobby. The result of this was that many Gentlemen who desired to vote "No" were prevented from doing so, while no similar disability was imposed on the Gentlemen who desired to vote "Aye." In these circumstances I would ask you whether it would not be proper that the division should again be called and carried out according to the rules of the House.

---

† The form in which the Amendment appeared on the Paper was as follows:—

"In page 3, line 21, at end, to insert, (2) In calculating the means of a person being one of a married couple living together in the same house, the means shall not in any case be taken to be a less amount than half the total means of the couple."

*THE CHAIRMAN: So far as the usual orders given from the Chair are concerned they were given in the ordinary way. I understand that a complaint is made by the right hon. Gentleman that the doors of the "Aye" lobby were not closed as quickly as those of the "No" lobby. It is my desire that the attendants should close the doors as quickly as possible, but it was obviously impossible that the doors of the "Aye" lobby could be closed as quickly as the doors of the "No" lobby because of the crowd of Members. What has happened in this case does not invalidate the division. We cannot have it again. [OPPOSITION cries of "It is not a division at all," and "It is a farce."]

The Tellers then approached the Table, and the figures were announced:—Ayes, 378; Noes, 31. (Division List No. 153.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Chares P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H'nry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P..
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fndlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michaael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)

Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTyd.)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmsworth.R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Col.Sir Ivor(Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt Hon David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
McCallum, John M.
McCrae, George
McKenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
McKillop, W.
McLaren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
McLaren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
McMicking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Patrick A.(Queen'sCo.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montague, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt.Hn A.C.(Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd. John
O'Grady, J.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E.(Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Robert John(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Grennock)
Stewart-Smith, D.(Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Keswick, William
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Nicholson, Wm, G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Stanier, Beville
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 28, after the word 'pension,' to insert the words 'or for the receipt of an old-age pension at a higher rate than that to which he would otherwise be entitled.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 381; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 154.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)

Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn SirW. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth,R. L (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.(Queen'sCo
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)

Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)

Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.

Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip

Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham

Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Clause 5:

Amendments made—

"In page 3, lines 31 and 32, to leave out the words 'shall be deemed to accrue from day to day, and.'"

"In page 3, line 33, after the word 'weekly,' to insert the words 'in advance.'"

"In page 4, line 1, to leave out subsection 3."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6, agreed to.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report progress; to sit again to-morrow.

MR. BOWLES said he desired to ask Mr. Speaker's ruling for the guidance of the House on the following matter. In the Resolution passed by the House on 17th June, in regard to the Old-Age Pensions Bill, it was provided—

> "That Mr. Speaker or the Chairman shall, at the time appointed under this Order for the conclusion of these proceedings, put forthwith the question on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the question of any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendment."

He desired to ask whether, under that provision, it was open to the Chair to put to the Committee or to the House an Amendment in any form other than that which has been placed on the Paper by the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: When the question arises I shall be very glad to give my decision upon it. [OPPOSITION cries of "It has arisen."] If the question has arisen, then it is one for the Chairman of Committees to decide.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. RAWLINSON moved that the Bill be read a third time on that day three months. He said that this was a very dull subject and he could hardly expect many hon. Members to take much interest in it, more especially at that late hour of the evening. As the House was probably aware, the London County Council in borrowing money was placed in a peculiar position, for they had to come to the House for permission. Any other corporation in a provincial city or borough had simply to satisfy the inspector of the Local Government Board that the loan was desirable. During the last two years he had had the privilege of bringing before the House various questions upon London County Council money Bills, and he wished to know from the promoters the reason why such a large sum was required to be borrowed in one year. The House would see how desirable it was that a satisfactory case for borrowing should be made out. He might say that he had not the slightest intention of dividing the House upon his Amendment. The first question he wished to put was whether the total indebtedness of the London County Council was increasing from year to year or was it remaining stationary. The next question was whether the total indebtedness was increasing or decreasing at any particular time. Last year they were in the happy position of finding that the County Council rate went down from 36d. to 35d. in the £. Unfortunately this year the rate has gone up again to the old high standard and that required some explanation. There was another point to which he had previously called attention and which had since been taken up by other hon. Members in connection with other private Bills, and he understood that the Government were appointing a committee to inquire into the question. The County Council took power under this Bill as they did last year to borrow money from the sinking fund for fresh expenditure. That was a financial process which he adversely criticised last year, and he still held the view that if they had had a Sinking Fund to meet capital expenditure that fund ought to be invested in some outside securities so that if the concern became financially unsound they would be able to come upon that fund for the payment of debt. In the case of the County Council power was taken to borrow from the sinking fund and that bad example had been followed in the case of various private Bills and had attracted the attention of hon. Members opposite, with the result that in one or two private Bills the practice had been stopped and he understood that the Government were now inquiring into the whole matter. Another point he desired to raise was the extended period of time allowed for the repayment of certain loans granted by the London County Council to boards of guardians. The period allowed was sixty years in some cases, and he thought such a period was excessive. With regard to the proposed new County Hall, the estimate for the site was £600,000, but up to the present there had been no estimate of the cost of the palatial building which it was proposed to erect. A sum of money was being borrowed this year for that building, and he thought the House should be informed by the promoters what the estimated cost of the building was. He noticed that there was a sum of £1,250,000 for loans in connection with tramways and other public improvements, and he should like to know how much of that was spent upon the subway from the Thames Embankment to Aldwich. He would also like to know what had become of the steamboats. He happened to be a small shareholder in the old steamboat company which used to run steamboats on the Thames, and this municipal enterprise with steamboats was about as good an object lesson as they could get of the result of municipal management. The original steamboat company ran a service upon the river which barely paid expenses, but instead of subsidising and assisting that company to run the boats at a profit the London County Council elected to run a service of their own. The result was that no steamboats were running at all now, because the old company had been run off the river. There appeared to be no item dealing with this matter in the measure before them, and, therefore, he would like to know how much of the capital expenditure had been recovered, how many of the steamboats had been sold, and whether they had been sold to purchasers in this country or abroad. He thought it was the duty of the House of Commons to scrutinise very closely the large sums of money which the London County Council continued to borrow year after year. He moved this Amendment in no spirit of hostility and he would not ask the House to proceed to a division.

SIR F. BANBURY seconded the Motion. He wished to emphasise what his hon. and learned friend had said in regard to the sinking fund. He was pleased to know that the Government had appointed a Committee to inquire into this practice. It was quite true that in regard to borrowing the London County Council were in a different position from other municipalities, but as that body was the largest of its kind it ought to set an example to all other bodies in regard to the manner in which it conducted its finances. There could not be any question that the habit of using the sinking fund for fresh borrowings was an extremely reprehensible practice, because it prevented the public knowing the extent of the Council's indebtedness. A corporation should only use the sinking fund by buying its own stock and cancelling it. If it did not do that, it ought to invest in trustee securities. If it did what the London County Council had unfortunately done, it would use it for the purpose of fresh borrowing for schemes such as new streets, or tramways, which were not realisable. They could not sell a sewer, an improved road, or a tramway, and, therefore, under these circumstances, the sinking fund, for all purposes of a sinking fund, disappeared. Another point to which he wished to call the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that it encouraged extravagance. If a municipality wanted to raise £500,000, and did not wish to go into the market, the temptation to take it from the sinking fund was very great, and the money so obtained might be spent in extravagant and unremunerative enterprises. He thought the House owed a great debt of gratitude to his hon. and learned friend for bringing forward this question. If the House went to a division, he would be inclined to support him. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, as representing the Treasury, could put a veto on this, at any rate, until the Committee which he had promised had reported.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question.

*MR. GUINNESS (Bury St. Edmunds) said that the House would be relieved to know that the hon. and learned Member who moved the Amendment did not intend to press it to a division. It was certainly of advantage that the methods under which the London County Council raised its moneys should be fully ventilated. He believed that if these methods were better understood, the County Council would be able to raise money more cheaply than if the public were in the dark on these matters. Parliament intended that closer supervision should be exercised over borrowing by the London County Council than in the case of other municipalities. Those who had taken an interest in the finances of the Council must have noticed that there was a large discrepancy between the amount of money actually spent and the amount authorised to be borrowed. That was because the Council was under obligation to state the outside figure which could possibly be required for a particular purpose. They were not allowed to transfer the saving under one head to meet the deficiency under another head. It was impossible to get a close estimate of the loans required by the local authorities. This year the Council was asking for considerably less than last year. Although £5,260,000 was authorised last year, only £3,236,000 was spent. This year the County Council asked £1,410,000 less for its own purposes. The total amount in this year's money Bill was £6,495,000, but that included loans to other authorities, and also £1,749,000 on account of the first six months of next year. It was necessary in that way to cover the period between the beginning of the County Council financial year, the 1st of April, and the time when next year's money Bill would receive the Royal assent. He was sorry to say that the indebtedness of the London County Council had gone up, but it was satisfactory to note that it had not gone up at such a rapid rate as in the previous year. The net debt at 31st March, 1908, was £49,938,000 as compared with £48,313,000 at the corresponding date in 1907, and £45,234,000 at the corresponding date in 1906. The rate for County Council purposes was now exactly the same as it was the year before last. When the new Council came into office they were able to reduce the education rate by 1d., but it was found necessary to increase it again to meet the growing expenditure on that service. The most important point raised by hon. Members was the question of the sinking fund. He would point out that the Treasury had to be satisfied that moneys borrowed from the sinking fund would be replaced before they were required to pay off debt, and for that reason, so far as he knew, it would be impossible to borrow money for the purpose of any loan for sixty years. The general purpose for which this money was borrowed from the Consolidated Loans Fund was to advance short loans to local authorities, and the Treasury before giving sanction always insisted on such arrangements as would ensure repayment to the sinking fund with interest before the maturing of the original loan. The County Council had no choice as to the insertion of this clause, because there was a Standing Order of the House of Commons regulating Private Bills which said—

> "No Bill promoted by the London County Council shall authorise any alteration in the mode of dealing with the Consolidated Loans Fund unless the Treasury specially report in favour of the alteration."

Therefore, he thought they might assume that the Treasury had considered this matter, and that it was regarded as satisfactory. They were obliged to buy under this Bill unless they were able to borrow from the Sinking Fund. The hon. Member for Cambridge University had raised a point in regard to the County Hall which was to be built, and had alluded to the fact that there had been no Parliamentary Estimate of the cost. No Parliamentary Estimate was necessary, for by the Local Government Act, Section 55, local authorities were authorised to erect the necessary buildings. The County Council Site Act of 1906 was necessary to give the County Council power to acquire land compulsorily, and that Act authorised the expenditure of £600,000 on the site. £384,000 had already been spent, and provision had been made for spending £175,000 this year. Hon. Members might be interested to learn that the present County Council had seen its way to decrease the estimate for building. The original estimate was to spend £1,600,000, but by means of restricting the building to a smaller site and not taking over the whole of the Holloway property, the estimated cost had been reduced by nearly £300,000. The hon. Member had also raised a point about the tramways, and had pointed out that some of the figures in the schedule were authorised under Parliamentary Estimates and others not. A good deal of the expenditure was authorised under the Tramways Act of 1870, and it was quite impossible to keep the expenditure under a special Act and under a general Act absolutely separate, because it was necessary to spend money on the assumption that the tramways were a growing concern, and to have in view the general interest of the whole concern. The hon. Member had asked what the cost was of the subway from the Strand to the Embankment. Up to the 31st December last the cost had been £185,000, and the amount in the authorising Bill was £250,000. There was also a provision of £6,500 in the present Money Bill. A question had been asked about the steamboats. These were now for sale, and he thought it would be inadvisable in the public interest to make any suggestion as to what the County Council thought was their present value. The loss on the steamboat service last year was £50,000, and it was advisable that the steamboats should be sold as soon as possible. He hoped that, as the hon. Member did not propose to divide on the Bill, he was satisfied with the explanations now given.

*Mr. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) said he wished to ask the hon. Member for Bury St. Edmunds if it was a fact that the present County Council had repaid no less than £60,000,000 of debt, as at the last County Council election it was put forth by the present majority that the debt was £110,000,000. That had been shown not to be the case, and he knew at the time the figures then given were absolutely untrue and only issued for election purposes.

Mr. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) said that what had been stated was that £110,000,000 was the total debt of London, which included the debt of the Water Board and some other boards.

*Mr. B. S. STRAUS asked if the statement that the debt of the London County Council was £110,000,000 was ever contradicted, or whether it was made for the purpose of misleading the electors.

*MR. SPEAKER said that that had nothing to do with this Bill.

Question, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question," put, and agreed to.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

SOUTH-WEST SUBURBAN WATER BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

*DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford) moved that the Bill be recommitted. He said the instruction he had put on the Paper was on behalf of a small neighbouring town, composed almost entirely of working-class people, and he moved it on their behalf because the water charges were excessive there. He wished to speak on behalf of the Southall Urban District Council. They did not wish to delay the Bill, and they did not desire to inconvenience any other districts supplied by this water company, but they had a serious grievance, which he would try and put before the House. To prove that this was a working-class district, in 1905, out of 2,911 properties, 2,457 were assessed at £20 and under. He understood that the question of excessive charges was going to be made a ground of opposition in the House of Lords by the Middlesex County Council, and if the Middlesex County Council said the charges were excessive, Southall, he thought, had all the more reason to feel that way. The present charges for water for domestic purposes were 8½ per cent. on the rateable value. The Bill provided that it should be 7½ per cent., but it was not an inclusive charge, and did not include baths, etc. The Metropolitan Water Board charges were 5 per cent. on the rateable value. The demand of Southall was that they should be charged at the same rate as the Water Board charged, but they were prepared to accept 7½ per cent., if it were an inclusive charge. When the matter was debated in Committee upstairs, Southall representatives offered to accept this, but they thought it was an inclusive charge, and as they now found it was not he asked the House to recommit the Bill. For water for public purposes the present charge was 1s. 3d. per 1,000 gallons, and under the Bill the same charge stood. The Metropolitan Water Board was only charging 6d., and the Southall Council demanded that they should have the same charge. But they were prepared to give way, and to meet this company, and to accept an average charge of 9d., that would be 6d. less than they were at present paying, So far as water for trade use was concerned the Bill provided that the charge should be 2s. This was very important, because the cost at present stood at 2s., and it affected the manufacturers at Southall most injuriously. The margarine works at Southall had found the cost of water to be so severe a strain on them that they had actually sunk their own wells and found their own water. This led to a reduction of the assessment and a loss to the local rates. He was informed, on the best evidence, that two manufacturers proposed to buy land in Southall to establish large factories there, and they were just on the completion of the purchase when they inquired into the water rate, and they found it was so great, for trade purposes, that they threw up the negotiations and declined to entertain them any more. This Bill, in its present form, damned Southall for trade and manufacturing purposes so long as it stood, and he hoped under the circumstances the House would think it reasonable to recommit the Bill. In a paper got out by the promoters, they suggested several reasons for the acceptance of the House and several why the Bill should not be recommitted. They said—

"The promoters accept loyally the decision of the Committee."

Of course they did, because they had got practically all they asked for. His feeling was that the Committee had given away the consumers, and had too much considered the owners. The promoters further said that it was somewhat unusual for a Bill to be recommitted. He thought the Committee had made a grievous mistake, and sacrificed the public interest for the private company's. The promoters also said—

"The Southall Council have their remedy in the second House."

That was a strange doctrine to preach to this Parliament, that any public authority should have to find salvation in the House of Lords, and he trusted that the Southall Council would not be put to the serious cost and expense of appealing to the House of Lords. The promoters also urged that the interests of Southall were carefully considered upstairs, and there was a clause to protect them. The council, however, thought that instead of protecting it was practically strangling Southall. Further, the promoters said that the representative of the Southall Council had practically accepted the agreement, and said it would be satisfactory to the council. But when he accepted that agreement he understood that the charge of 7½ per cent. would be inclusive, and afterwards he found it was not. The Committee were under some misapprehension. He believed the hon. Member for Stoke would be able to speak more clearly than he could as to what happened in the Committee upstairs. The council felt that the charge for baths was contrary to all laws of science and health, and Parliament laid down this principle quite distinctly and clearly last year, when they granted an Act to the Metropolitan Water Board, in which this provision was made statutory. He understood the promoters also said that they could no afford to reduce their rates. Well, if they could not afford to do that, their business was to make way for those who could. The Water Board already supplied part of Southall, and naturally the council preferred that the Board should supply the whole of their area. If the Government would meet the Southall Council satisfactorily along the lines he had mentioned, they were prepared to come to terms with the promoters and to make the best of the matter. He trusted, for the reputation of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, that he would support the contention he had tried to lay before the House, and that, for the reputation of the House, they would not sacrifice the interests of public authorities and of the community to the interests of a private company.

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) seconded. He was one of the members of the Committee appointed to consider the proposals contained in the Bill. With almost every remark of the hon. Member for Brentford he entirely agreed. During the early part of the consideration of the measure, the Committee came to the conclusion that the company was a very shaky concern and had never performed its legal and statutory obligations in any shape or form, but unfortunately it had a great area of population under its control. The Committee took that into consideration, although he believed the preamble was only proved by the casting vote of the Chairman, who voted first also on the first division. While the Committee felt inclined, on the evidence presented to them as to the business methods of this company, to reject the preamble of the Bill, yet they felt it would place the locality in so serious a position that they could not take the responsibility. The company was a sort of one-man show. He thought a gentleman of the name of Howard first got the concession, and gradually it had been extended and certain powers had been secured, and either never used or not carried out to their proper extent. The locality had had very good and serious reason to complain of the way in which the company had treated them for a long time. Southall was the only working-class district within the company's jurisdiction, and the great difficulty was that the Metropolitan Water Board supplied part of the neighbourhood at a uniform rate of 5 per cent. inclusive. The Bill passed through the House in 1906 made a uniform charge all over the Metropolitan Water Board area, and there was now a peculiar position of affairs. Here was a part of this working class neighbourhood supplied at an inclusive charge of 5 per cent. and if the proposals of the Southall Council, of 7½ per cent., were agreed to there would be a difference of 2½ per cent. Not satisfied with this 2½ per cent. more than the Metropolitan Water Board charges, which were inclusive, the company wanted to charge, in addition, extra for baths and public service, and for half a dozen other things. His opinion was, having considered the whole subject, that the company ought to be well satisfied, seeing that the Metropolitan Water Board supplied a portion of the district for a uniform and inclusive charge of 5 per cent. The unfortunate part of the business of this Bill was that even if the recommendation of the hon. Member for Brentford were carried out, there would be one part of the locality of Southall supplied at the uniform and inclusive charge of 5 per cent., and the remaining part at 7½ per cent. The Committee agreed to that, and so did the Southall Council, but it appeared that the Committee mentioned that they were prepared to apply to this locality the Sunningdale agreement. The company supplied Sunningdale, and some of them thought that meant an inclusive charge of 7½ per cent., and the Southall District Council thought so also. But the counsel for the company soon informed them that the Sunningdale agreement was not only a charge of 7½ per cent. on the whole locality, but in addition these extras. A division of the Committee took place with reference to that, and he was not prepared to say what the decision of the Committee was regarding it, but it was eventually decided by a majority that these extras should be included in the Bill. Unless the company were prepared to accept the 7½ per cent. he thought the House would be well advised to recommit the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'be,' and add the words 're-committed to the former Committee.'"—(*Dr. Rutherford.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) said that in regard to the reference made by the hon. Member for Stoke to the financial stability of this water company, he (Mr. Burdett-Coutts) was not in a position to criticise those remarks, but it seemed to him that they were an argument against the Committee granting the Bill to the company at all, and not an argument in favour of what was now proposed, of giving exceptional treatment to one of the eight local authority areas concerned, by this instruction now before the House. He understood that the Bill was four days before a competent Committee. The point now at issue was thoroughly thrashed out, and counsel and witnesses were heard, and all the arguments, which could not perhaps be put so fully to the House that night, were placed before the Committee, and the Committee came to a certain decision on grounds which appealed to the Committee and under circumstances which generally appealed to the House, to support a Committee's decision. Now an hon. Member came, and by placing before the House arguments which he thought it was impossible for the House really to examine, endeavoured to maintain the claim he was unable to substantiate before the Committee. It was a very serious matter for the House on such a very cursory and superficial examination of the subject, to upset the careful and considered judgment of one of its Committees in this way. It was still more serious that the House, without being able thoroughly to examine the clauses of the Bill, should take upon itself to give special treatment to one of eight areas which were dealt with in the Bill, and especially as that special area had already had a large concession made to it by Clause 25. It would seriously interfere with the efficient progress of business in regard to Private Bills if the considered judgment of the Committee, based on four days careful examination, was to be upset by what he was bound to call — although he had no doubt they were perfectly sincere—*ex parte* statements.

Mr. WATERLOW (Islington, N.) said he was one of the members of this Committee, and wished to say a few words on the Question. The issue was very clear. It was that this particular district of Southall should be put on the same terms as the Metropolitan Water Board supplied to the surrounding and neighbouring districts.

*Dr. RUTHERFORD: I said distinctly that we were prepared to accept more moderate and inclusive terms. We were prepared to meet the company half way.

Mr. WATERLOW said that that might be so, but the House had to deal with the Amendment on the Paper, and if it were carried it would be an instruction to the Committee to do certain things, and consequently, although Southall might be willing to accept other terms than on the Paper, the position was as he had stated. The House would give certain definite instructions to the Committee, and the Committee would be bound to accept those instructions. The issue was the Metropolitan Water Board terms as against the terms granted to Southall. With reference to the divisions on the Committee; they had only two, and neither of them was relative to this issue. He cordially sympathised with the position of Southall; it was undoubtedly a difficult one, as it was bounded on two and nearly three sides by the Metropolitan Water Board. There was no doubt that if that Board were willing to take over Southall, and this company were willing to surrender it, that would be the most satisfactory solution for Southall. But there was no power for the Board to take away this district from the existing company, and there was no power in the hands of the Committee to take this particular area and put it in the hands of the Water Board. He did not know if they would have it, even if Southall's present company were willing to hand it over. Southall was certainly to be sympathised with; it had the Water Board's mains running right through its areas, and the largest reservoirs in the world almost within a mile of it, and yet it had to pay much more for its water than the adjoining districts, and it was hindered undoubtedly by the fact that manufacturers who might otherwise desire to come into the Southall area could get very much cheaper terms for water immediately on the boundaries. But this raised one very big issue. The terms and prices of the Metropolitan Water Board were only possible when backed up by the immense rateable value of London. In other words, the centre of London had to some extent to assist the outside areas, and his impression was that it was not possible for a small water company like this one to supply water at the price of the Metropolitan Water Board on a remunerative basis. That was the position the House had to face, and it raised a very serious question, because if this particular area was to receive Metropolitan Water Board prices by the direction of the House, the issue was one which affected all water companies on the fringe of the Metropolitan Water Board's area, and there would be a very large number of them. It would set a very serious precedent. The position which would arise would be that every small water company on the fringe of the Metropolitan Water Board's area would not apply to Parliament for fresh powers which they might require, for fear they should have Metropolitan Water Board charges imposed on them, whether they could stand them or not. That was a serious issue, and he saw no way out of it, and that was why he supported the Committee that evening, although he sympathised with the unfortunate position in which Southall was placed.

*MR. DU CROS (Hastings) thought that the hon. Member for Stoke perhaps inadvertently had left the House under some misapprehension in regard to the facts of the case. The hon. Member was not a Member of the Committee throughout the whole of the proceedings, and when it came to deal with the specific question of charges he was no longer in the room. He had stated to the House that the charges were agreed to by the casting vote of the Chairman. As a matter of fact that did not take place. The Committee were absolutely unanimous on the question of charges and there was no division in regard to that part of the Bill at all. He had also stated that there was a division in regard to the terms of the Sunningdale agreement, whereas no such division took place. He had also led the House to believe that the majority of the Committee were in favour of allowing these extra charges for baths and other domestic purposes to be included in the rate of 7½ per cent. allowed to the Sunningdale district. There was no division on that point either, and he (Mr. Du Cros) could only say again that throughout the proceedings the Committee were absolutely unanimous on the whole question of charges. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Member for Brentford, he could only say he did not think that his contentions were supported by any argument, and when he said that the district of Southall was adversely affected by the Bill, it was absolutely contrary to all the evidence of the witnesses called by the Southall Council. Each of those witnesses, when the specific point was put as to whether they would be better with the Bill or without it, replied in the most definite way that they would much prefer that the Bill went through, and that Southall would be in a much better position if it did go through. The hon. Member appeared to be under the impression that the Southall Council made an offer to the Committee of 7½ per cent., and that that offer was adopted by the Committee, and that there was some difference of opinion as to whether it included the extra charges. As a matter of fact the Committee were perfectly cognisant of the fact that the extra charges were not included in the 7½ per cent., and there was no such mistake as had been suggested. Dealing with the criticism of the company, he wished to say that it had been in existence for twenty-six years, and a dividend had been paid during that time, averaging about 2 per cent. The quality of the water supplied left a good deal to be desired, and the quantity was also very deficient, and the whole question of charges was, in the opinion of the Committee, necessary matter for discussion. They considered that the complaints of the Southall Council were perfectly justified on these points. The Bill before the Committee was a money Bill, pure and simple, and the object of the company was to raise money for the purpose of enabling it to carry out its statutory obligations, and remedy the complaints made against it. That was made manifest by the fact that the accounts of the company were overdrawn by some £11,000. They had no capital to extend their mains or to give a proper or pure supply to the area within their control. The Southall Council made certain claims on the Committee, and they met them all. As a matter of fact they did not extend to the Southall Council the "most-favoured-nation" clause, as the hon. Member who had just spoken suggested, but gave them even better terms than any other district council of the eight included in the area. They included in Clause 5 of the Bill many special points for their protection, in order to meet the points raised by the Council. He hoped the House would support the Committee; he assured them that every point and line in the Bill had been most carefully considered. Many witnesses were examined and counsel heard by the Committee. It was in the public interest that the Bill should pass, and if these charges were altered in the manner suggested by the hon. Member, the company would be unable to raise the capital necessary to enable them to secure a good and adequate supply of water for this area.

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) said he only rose to make one remark. The Metropolitan Water Board had been alluded to a good deal that evening. They took part before the Committee, and they did not get their way. At the same time they accepted loyally the decision of the Committee, and he only rose to say that they were not interfering there that evening, though they would raise the same point on a future opportunity when it arrived. It had been mentioned that the Metropolitan Water Board might buy out this company. He wished the House clearly to understand that the Board had no power of any description whatever to buy this or any other company. It was a great comfort to him to hear that evening that the Board's charges were lower somewhere, because he had heard in the City of nothing but complaints as to the high charges. He personally should vote most cordially for the Third Reading of the Bill.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," put, and agreed to.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

And, it being half-past Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday evening, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at twenty-one minutes before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 1st July, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Liverpool Corporation (General Powers). The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Report from, That the Standing Orders not complied with in respect of the petition for an additional provision in the Ards and Bangor Railways Bill, ought to be dispensed with and leave given to the Committee on the Bill to insert the additional provision.

Read, and agreed to.

London County Council (Money) Bill, South West Suburban Water Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners.

Educational Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, &c.) Bill [H.L.].—(Swansea Orders No. 1 and No. 2); London County Council (General Powers) Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Central Ireland Electric Power Bill; Widnes Corporation Bill; Tyne Improvement Bill. Report from the Committee of Selection that the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills, viz.: E. Stradbroke, V. Hutchinson (E. Donoughmore) chairman, L. Dunboyne, L. Elphinstone, L. Hindlip; agreed to, and the said Lords appointed accordingly. The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Twelve o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committees made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received to-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received to-morrow.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committees made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received to-morrow.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received to-morrow.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received to-morrow.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. House in Committee (according to order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The report of Amendments to be received to-morrow.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL RETURNS.

No. 4020. Italy (Consular District of Genoa); No. 4051. Mexico (Consular District of Tampico); No. 4053. France (Consular District of Nice); No. 4054. Brazil; No. 4055. United States (Consular District of New Orleans); No. 4056. Turkey (Crete).

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 562. Falkland Islands.

TREATY SERIES (1908).

No. 17. Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America, respecting the protection,

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

preservation, and propagation of food fishes in the waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada; signed at Washington, 11th April, 1908. (Ratifications exchanged at Washington, 4th June, 1908.)

No. 18. Treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States of America, respecting the demarcation of the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada; signed at Washington, 11th April, 1908. Ratifications exchanged at Washington, 4th June, 1908.

WAGES BOARDS AND INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION (AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZELAND).

Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by Ernest Aves, Esq., on the Wages Boards and Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts of Australia and New Zealand.

SHOP HOURS ACT (AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND).

Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by Ernest Aves, Esq., on the Acts for the regulation of hours of employment in shops in Australia and New Zealand.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS.

Annual Report of Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops, for the year 1907. Report and statistics.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS (MASTERS) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to make provision with respect to the tenure of office of masters of endowed schools.—Was presented by the Lord Steward (E. Beauchamp); read 1ª; to be printed, and to be read 2ª on Tuesday next. (No. 120.)

COMPANIES CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].

POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L].

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [H.L.].

Commons message considered (according to order). The Lord Balfour and the Lord Faber added to the Joint Committee; a Message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith, and to propose that the Joint Committee do meet in Committe Room A. on Wednesday next at Two o'clock.

ACCIDENTS IN PORTSMOUTH HARBOUR.

LORD MUSKERRY rose to ask whether His Majesty's Government could furnish particulars concerning a series of accidents which recently befel the steamship "Bengore Head" in Portsmouth Harbour; if so, what was her draft of water at the time, and whether these accidents were attributable to the "Bengore Head" being in an unmanageable condition owing to a want of sufficient ballast.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, before putting the Question that stands in my name, I would like to say a few words in connection with it. When I was advocating in this House the passing of the Light Load Line Bill I argued that the provision of a light load mark might very well be extended to, and enforced on, foreign vessels sailing in our waters, for this reason—that vessels that were not sufficiently ballasted were unmanageable under certain circumstances, and therefore not only a source of danger to themselves, but also to any other vessels that might be near. If my information is right, and this steamer was unmanageable through want of sufficient ballast, it is another proof that my contention is correct. I may say that I am not alone in my views as to the unseaworthiness through not being under proper control of these underballasted vessels. I think you will find that every sailor, or marine engineer, holds the same opinion. Had the "Bengore Head," as she might well have done, sunk one of His Majesty's ships, it would have meant a very serious pecuniary loss to the nation, to say nothing of the lives which might have been sacrificed.

But what I specially want to do in connection with this Question is to enter an earnest protest against the callous indifference with which the safety of seamen's lives appears to be regarded by a Government Department. Where the vessels are carrying passengers, it is true that every human precaution is taken; but this is not so when only the lives of their crews are concerned. Your Lordships have only to refer back to the pages of *Hansard* for the past ten years, and see from the replies that I have received when I have advocated precautionary measures for the safety of sailors' lives that they have been refused mainly from the point of view that shipowners would incur additional expense. Now I venture to say that if it were a question of taking precautions against loss of life on shore no Government, or Government Department, would dare to advance such an argument against them. Think if the "Bengore Head" instead of being in a harbour had been on a rocky lee shore, with a gale blowing; what poor chance there would have been for the lives of her crew? I again most emphatically protest against our seamen's lives being considered as second to any pecuniary interests whatever, and I am sure that in this I have the support and sympathy of your Lordships.

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, I quite agree that if the accident to which the noble Lord alludes could be proved to have been due to the ship having been insufficiently ballasted, it would be an argument in favour of the establishment of a light load line; but, as a matter of fact, the information in the possession of the Board of Trade points in a precisely opposite direction. I think that my best course will be to read a statement prepared from several reports which have been made to the Board of Trade by, amongst others, the master of the ship, the principal officer of the Board of Trade on marine registry, and the Board of Trade surveyor at Southampton. I am informed that the steamship "Bengore Head" left the Government dockyard at Portsmouth at 2.30 p.m. on 13th June, in charge of a Trinity House pilot and assisted by a tug. When turning the north corner of the jetty the tug boat, owing to a violent squall, got out of position, and to avoid accident to his vessel the master of the tug boat threw off the tow rope, thus leaving the "Bengore Head" practically unmanageable, as, owing to the limited space between His Majesty's ships and the lack of room to manœuvre, it was impossible to make satisfactory use of the ship's engines. The starboard anchor was at once let go, but, notwithstanding, the vessel drifted against H.M.S. "Revenge" and afterwards did some slight damage to the torpedo net booms of H.M.S. "Vengeance." The draft of water of the "Bengore Head" at the time was 14 feet 11 inches aft, and I am advised that the accident was in no way attributable to the want of sufficient ballast, the propeller being well immersed.

A NOBLE LORD: What was her tonnage?

LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: I think 1,600 tons.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, this question of the accident which befel the s.s. "Bengore Head" is far more an Admiralty question than a Board of Trade question. In the then existing conditions of wind and weather the vessel ought not to have been moved at all. The pilots who take our ships in and out of harbour do manage their vessels exceedingly well, and I look upon it as a great triumph that two years ago they brought in the whole of the French Fleet in one tide into Portsmouth harbour without any accident whatever. Supposing the "Bengore Head" had filled with water and remained aground off Blockhouse Point; owing to its position no ship could have got in or out of Portsmouth harbour, and if such a thing were to occur at a time of strained relations with a foreign Power it would be a serious matter. I think the Admiralty should have control of all shipping in Portsmouth Harbour in order to avoid what might prove a national danger, and I hope, therefore, that the Admiralty will take this matter into their consideration.

THE POSITION OF THE MILITIA.

THE DUKE OF BEDFORD: My Lords, I rise to ask the Lord Chancellor if, having regard to the following sections of the Militia Act of 1882, a Militiaman can during his term of service be appointed, transferred, or attached, without his consent, to any military body other than that to which he at present belongs, viz.:

"Section 4, subsection 3. Subject to the provisions of any such order, a Secretary of

State may from time to time make, and when made revoke and vary, general or special regulations with respect to any matter with respect to which Her Majesty may make orders under this section.

"Subsection 4. Provided that the said orders or regulations shall not—(*a*) affect or extend the term for which or the area within which a Militiaman is liable under the Militia Acts to serve; or (*b*) authorise a Militiaman when belonging to one corps to be transferred without his consent to another corps; or (*c*) where the corps of a Militiaman includes any battalion or other body of the Regular Forces, authorise him to be posted without his consent to that battalion or body.

"Subsection 5. Where a Militiaman was enlisted or re-engaged before the date of any order or regulation under this Act, nothing in such order or regulation shall render him liable without his consent to be appointed, transferred, or attached to any military body to which he could not without his consent have been appointed, transferred, or attached, if the said order or regulation had not been made."

By the whole of the Militia force the Act has always been read to mean that transfer without the men's consent was not possible. The question arises at the present moment in this way. As each Militia regiment completes its training the men have three alternatives—they may go to the Special Reserve, they may take a free discharge, or they may remain Militiamen until their period of service expires. In the last case they receive the non-training bounty but are not called out, though they remain subject to the Act of 1882 and to embodiment. The question, therefore, arises: If these men are called out after the Militia is abolished what are you going to do with them? It would appear necessary to attach them to some regiment of the Line, and I ask if that is possible without the men's consent.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I am not an authority on military matters, but my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War has desired that I should present the legal Answer to the noble Duke. The Question of the noble Duke raises the point as to what will be the position of a Militiaman who has not enlisted in the Special Reserve. Different considerations appear to apply in the case of a Militiaman belonging to a Militia unit which has been transferred to the Special Reserve by an Order in Council under Section 34 of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, 1907, and in the case of a Militiaman who belonged to one of the Militia units which have been disbanded. In the former case, by virtue of Section 34 (2) of the Act of 1907, the Militiaman becomes a Special Reservist for all purposes, except that the terms and conditions of service are those which were applicable to him whilst he was in the Militia, and not those applicable to Special Reservists. But the unit to which he belongs retains its identity and remains part of the same corps as that in which the Militia unit was previously included. In the latter case, the Militiaman ceased on the disbandment of the Militia unit to belong to any corps, but otherwise remains subject to the terms and conditions of his Militia service. Though, therefore, Section 4 of the Militia Act, 1882, continues to apply in each case, the result of its application will be different. In the case of the man belonging to the transferred unit he can be transferred or attached, without his consent, to any military body to which he could have been so transferred or attached whilst he was still in the Militia, and he could be called out for training or on permanent service with his unit, but the length of his training with the unit could not exceed that to which he was liable under the Militia Acts, and probably, in order to call him out on permanent service, it would be necessary to embody the Militia, as he would not be affected by a proclamation calling out the Army Reserve. With respect to the Militiaman belonging to the disbanded unit, it is clear that, not belonging to any corps, he could not, unless the Militia were embodied at any rate, be transferred or attached to any military body without his consent. He could, however, be called up for annual training, and trained with a Special Reserve battalion, though not attached to that battalion. The only difference his not being attached to the battalion would make would be that he would not be bound by an order issued to the battalion unless specially named in the order. On embodiment of the Militia, however, the provisions in the Militia Regulations, which provide that the Militia when embodied shall be governed by the provisions contained in the various warrants relating to the Regular forces, and by the regulations and orders laid down for the Regular forces, so far as such warrants, regulations, and orders may be applicable to the Militia, would apply to him, and, consequently, without his consent, he could be attached to any military body to which, under the King's Regulations, a soldier of the Regular forces could be attached, though, of course, he could not be attached to a military body sent on service outside the United Kingdom. I am sorry the Question could not be answered more shortly than I have endeavoured to do.

ASSIZES AND QUARTER SESSIONS BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 1st *July*, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Merthyr Tydfil Corporation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Taff Vale Railway Bill [Lords].—Reported with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill; Seaham Harbour Dock Bill, with an Amendment.

Stockport Corporation Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Southwell District Gas Bill, with Amendments.

"That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend The Criminal Appeal Act, 1907, with reference to the Appointment of the Judges of the Court of Criminal Appeal and the Appointment of a Deputy Registrar." [Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill [Lords].

Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords] Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords], and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords]. That they communicate that they have added two Lords to the Joint Committee appointed to consider the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords], Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords], and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords], as desired by this House, and propose that the said Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room A on Wednesday next, at Two of the Clock.

PETITIONS.

CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from Norwich, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions from Stroud, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour:—From Birmingham; Cwmgorse; Esh Winning and Waterhouses; Gower (two); Leeds (two); Llanrlidan; Llansannan; Luton; Nebo Llanrwst; Norwich (five); Pembroke Dock and Sowerby Bridge; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report No. 562 (Falkland Islands, Annual Report for 1907; [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

WAGES BOARDS AND INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION (AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by Ernest Aves, Esquire, on the Wages Boards and Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts of Australia and New Zealand [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT (AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by Ernest Aves, Esquire, on the Acts for the Regulation of Hours of Employment in Shops in Australia and New Zealand [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Chief Inspector for 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 17, 1908).

Copy presented, of Convention between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting the Protection, Preservation, and Propagation of Food Fishes in the Waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada. Signed at Washington, 11th April, 1908. Ratifications exchanged at Washington, 4th June, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 18, 1908).

Copy presented, of Treaty between the United Kingdom and the United States of America respecting the Demarcation of the International Boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada. Signed at Washington, 11th April, 1908. Ratifications exchanged at Washington, 4th June, 1908; [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 4020, 4051, and 4053 to 4056 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Copy presented, of Rules made by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Elementary Schools (in force from 1st August, 1908) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Public Records (Treasury) (African Companies), Copy of Classes of Documents among the Records of the Royal African Company and the Company of Merchants Trading to Africa, which have been removed from the Office of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient Public value to justify their preservation therein [by Act].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Bristol Post Office Vacancies and Members of Postal Associations.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether vacancies exist for the position of second-class superintendent and two overseerships in the Bristol telegraph office; whether the postmaster at that office regards the membership of the Postal Telegraph Clerks' Association as being a disqualification for the positions, and has made inquiries respecting the attendance of members of the staff at association functions in connection with his recommendations for these superior positions; and whether, in view of the fact that a well-known non-trade unionist was especially selected to fill a recent vacancy over the heads of senior men holding superior technical qualifications, he will inquire into the administration at Bristol.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I would refer the hon. Member to paragraph 95 of the recent Report of the Select Committee on Post Office Servants. That paragraph, with which I entirely agree, states the principles which I have always followed in making promotions in the service. No distinction is made between members of associations and others.

H.M. Yacht "Victoria and Albert."

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what is to be the future of His Majesty's yacht "Victoria and Albert" now that she has been replaced by a new vessel; is she to be sold; and, if so, will he see that the breaking-up clause is not insisted on, so that a much larger sum may be got for the benefit of the nation?

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) There is no intention of selling His Majesty's yacht "Victoria and Albert," which has not been replaced by a new vessel.

Coal Residues in Reinforced Concrete.

MR. RIDSDALE (Brighton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that the use of coal residues in reinforced concrete for building purposes has been forbidden throughout Germany on account of its danger; whether such materials are in common use in this country; and, if so, what steps, if any, he proposes to take.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have no official information as to the use of the materials referred to being prohibited for building purposes in Germany. I have, however, seen some statements in the newspapers to this effect. I am aware that these materials are in common use in this country, and I propose to obtain some further information as to the result of such use, and also as to how the matter has been dealt with in Germany.

Fishing and Foreshore Rights in Scotland.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the decision of the Court of Session in the case of Smith *v.* Lerwick Harbour Trustees, 1903, F., 680, that the law of udal and not of feudal tenure applies to the foreshore as well as to the rest of the solum of the Shetland Islands, and of the subsequent decision in the case of the Lord Advocate *v.* Balfour, 1907, Session Cases, 1360, in which the Lord Ordinary held that the reasoning in that Shetland case applies equally in Orkney, that in Orkney the feudal law of salmon-fishing does not apply, and that the right of fishing for salmon in Orkney is not inter regalia, if the question as to whether the right of oyster-fishery in Orkney is or is not inter regalia has been considered with reference to the Oyster and Mussel Fishery (Bay of Firth) Provisional Order Bill; and, if so, what conclusion has been arrived at.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The procedure being under the specific powers conferred by the Sea Fisheries Act of 1868, I am advised that no question of the nature indicated by my hon. friend arises.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has powers under Section 5 of The Fisheries (Oyster, Crab, and Lobster) Act, 1877, to prohibit, restrict, and regulate the fishing of oysters at the Bay of Firth, in Orkney; whether, if the Oyster and Mussel Fishery (Bay of Firth) Provisional Order Confirmation Bill, which is designed to create a several oyster fishery over an area of about 4,500 acres for a period of 60 years, becomes law, he will be precluded from exercising his powers under that section over that area while that Order is in force, and the only remedy in the event of that fishery not being conducted satisfactorily will be to repeal the Order by a certificate under Section 45 of The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, under which Act the Provisional Order Bill is being promoted; and why the creation of a private monopoly in this public oyster fishery under the Act of 1868 is preferred to the regulation of it, in the interests of the public, under the Act of 1877.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Secretary for Scotland has power, under Section 5 of The Sea Fisheries (Oyster, Crab, and Lobster) Act, 1877, to prohibit, restrict, and regulate the fishing of oysters, but that power does not extend to places where a several oyster fishery is constituted by Order under The Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, the remedy for unsatisfactory administration in such cases being as stated by my hon. friend. Mere prohibition, restriction, or regulation would now have little effect in resuscitating the beds at the Bay of Firth. What is wanted is the cultivation of the beds on approved modern methods, and neither the Secretary for Scotland nor the Fishery Board have powers or funds for this purpose. Every effort to get local public bodies to take up the matter failed, and the Fishery Board were compelled to fall back on the proposal for a public syndicate. I am informed that no public interest is being violated, while, on the other hand, the operations of the syndicate will afford employment to a number of the local people.

Alleged Assault of a Warder by Governor of Ayr Prison.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been drawn to an inquiry held by the Prison Commissioners into a charge made by Warder F. W. McDonald that he had been assulted by the Governor of Ayr Prison; whether he is aware that, although McDonald's statement was corroborated, he was reprimanded and otherwise punished; and whether he will make full inquiry into the case with a view to securing justice to this warder.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) This case has been carefully investigated, and it has been found that the statement of the warder that the Governor assulted him by striking him a violent blow which caused an illness is disproved. I am aware that the warder was reprimanded and placed upon special probation for one year.

Alnwick Post Office Drains.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the Postmaster General if he can state whether the defects appertaining to the drains at Alnwick post office have been carried out; and, if so, as to whether the health conditions are now of a satisfactory character.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The work necessary for remedying the defects in the Alnwick post office has been ordered, but its execution has been delayed by local difficulties. These have, I understand, now been overcome, and the work will be put in hand at once.

Purchase of Inverliever Estate, Argyllshire.

MR. WATT: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in connection with the purchase of Inverliever, Argyllshire, for afforestation, what were the casualties the redemption of which was included in the price of £2,110, or 33 years' purchase, paid for the feu duty; what was the value placed upon these casualties by his Department; and who was the seller of the feu duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The purchase from the Duke of Argyll for £2,110 was of certain rights of superiority in parts of the Inverliever estate and included feu duties payable to His Grace amounting to £62 19s. 10d. sterling, and certain casualties. The casualties are as to part untaxed, and a composition for this part would amount approximately to £380. As to a further part there is a question as to whether the composition is taxed at a nominal sum or not. If it is untaxed the amount would be about £45. The statutory rate for redeeming casualties is one-and-a-half times the highest casualty. The transaction was dealt with as a whole, and the Commissioners of Woods were advised that the price agreed upon was reasonable.

Service in Armed Forces of the Crown as Qualification for Old-age Pensions.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can recommend that any man who has served His Majesty, either in the Volunteer Navy or in the Territorial Army for a term of years shall be considered eligible for an old-age pension, so far as character is concerned, without any further inquiry.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) There is no disqualification in respect of character except for actual criminality, and the only test for the purpose of which service in the forces of the Crown could in practice be taken into account is the industry test contained in paragraph (*b*) of Clause 3, subsection 1, of the Bill. The matter was carefully considered when that paragraph was drafted, but it did not appear to be possible to treat what would in many cases be only a short period of such service performed early in life as conclusive evidence of an applicant's industrial character, without any regard to his history during the subsequent period between his leaving the service and applying for a pension.

Establishment of a British Post Office at Jerusalem.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is yet in a position to announce a decision on the question of the establishment of a British post office in Jerusalem.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey*). A letter informing the hon. Member of that decision was despatched from the Foreign Office yesterday.

Local Loans for Extension of Union Buildings.

MR. T. R. BETHELL (Essex, Maldon): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether in view of the prospective reform of our present Poor Law system the sanction by the Local Government Board to the borrowing of money by boards of guardians for the purpose of extending union buildings will be withheld, except in cases where the works are of a specially urgent character.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Board would not lose sight of the point referred to in dealing with proposals for building made to them, but I do not think that any general rule can be laid down on the subject. Each case must be considered on its own merits.

American Gooseberry Mildew.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether in the sixty-eight recent outbreaks of the American gooseberry mildew in the summer stage, attributed by them as probably due to imperfect pruning, the plantations, in which these outbreaks or any of them have occurred, had been passed by the Board's inspector as properly pruned according to the requirements of the order of the Board.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The plantations to which the hon. Member refers were, with one exception, to all appearances pruned as required by the Board's order, and their inspectors reported that no further visits were necessary before the summer. The Board recognise that disease is likely to recur in certain cases, and therefore provided in their American Gooseberry Mildew Order of 1907 that no infected premises should be freed for twelve months after disease last appeared there, so long as any bushes remain on the premises. The gardens will of course be kept under observation during that time.

The Provincial Homes Investment Company.

MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to a company named the Provincial Homes Investment Company, whose operations are advertised to assist the working classes in buying their houses; whether he is aware that meetings of dissatisfied certificate holders are being held in various towns where it is alleged the holders have been unable to obtain advances on their properties in accordance with the prospectus of this company; and will he cause an inquiry to be made into the workings of this company.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*). I have received several letters of complaint from dissatisfied holders of certificates in a company named the Provincial Homes Investment Company, Limited, and I have been informed that meetings have been held. The Board of Trade have no general power to institute an inquiry as suggested by my hon. friend. The only power vested in the Board of Trade is the power to appoint an inspector in accordance with the provisions of Sections 56 to 59 of The Companies Act, 1862, on the application of shareholders holding not less than one-tenth of the whole of the shares of the company for the time being issued.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Highflyer."

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the temporary repairs to the main starboard crank-shaft of H.M.S. "Highflyer" have yet been completed; whether she is returning to England forthwith for permanent repair; and what ship relieves her.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton): The repairs on H.M.S. "Highflyer" undertaken at Bombay have been completed, and she is now at Colombo. The present intention is for her to meet her relief, H.M.S. "Fox," at Suez, in the middle of August. On her return home, further repairs will be undertaken at one of the home dockyards.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Is the right hon. Gentleman satisfied that now the temporary repairs are completed it will be safe for the "Highflyer" to go through the Indian Ocean when monsoons are prevalent?

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, Sir.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is this the flagship of the East Indian squadron?

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, she is quite capable of doing the work at present required of her. She will soon be relieved.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON: But is not the "Fox" at present taking part in the manœuvres? How can she be sent there by the time named?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Notice had better be given of the Question.

Debates on Navy Estimates.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty what was the average number of hours devoted to discussion of Navy Estimates in Committee of Supply and on Report during the two concluding years of the last Government; and what were the corresponding figures for 1906 and 1907.

Mr. LAMBERT: In Committee of Supply Naval Estimates were discussed in 1904 on five days; 1905, five days; 1906, four days; 1907, five days. In 1904 one day was devoted to Supplementary Estimates, and there were three short discussions on Report.

Mr. ASHLEY: Shall we have five days this year?

Mr. LAMBERT: That Question should be addressed to the Prime Minister.

Mr. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): Do these figures include the time devoted to the Motion to go into Committee of Supply?

Mr. LAMBERT: No, Sir. I distinctly said: "in Committee of Supply."

Coastguardsmen in the Fleet.

Mr. GRETTON (Rutland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how many coastguards have been required to man the fleet mobilising on 1st July; and how many have actually been included in the ships' complements.

Mr. LAMBERT: I beg to refer the hon. Member to my right hon. friend's reply to the Question of the hon. Member for Great Yarmouth on 29th June, in which he said that the number of coastguard men to be embarked is 1,300. All of them will be in the ships' complements.

H.M.S. "Irresistible."

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty when the official inquiry is to be held into the flooding of the engine-room of the battleship "Irresistible" up to the level of the water outside; and, in view of the warnings that have been addressed to the Admiralty as to the danger of entrusting the work of skilled engine-room artificers to imperfectly trained mechanicians, whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the circumstances under which one of the new mechanician class was entrusted with the duty of dealing with the valves through which the ship was flooded.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Report of the Court of Inquiry which has been held on the flooding of the "Irresistible" was received at the Admiralty on 17th June, and referred to the technical officers for observations. The Board have not yet considered the Report.

Sailors' Grog.

Mr. MEYSEY THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he will consider the advisability of allowing sailors in the Royal Navy the option of drawing 1d. per day in lieu of their grog.

MR. LAMBERT: This matter is already receiving consideration, and reports have been called for from the Fleet with a view to ascertaining how many men would be likely to take advantage of such an option if granted, and what the extra expense to Navy Votes would be.

MR. MEYSEY THOMPSON: But is not the grog now given worth 1d.? Would there not be a saving? If the right hon. Gentleman gets an undertaking that no extra expense will be incurred will he grant this privilege?

MR. LAMBERT: The matter is receiving consideration.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): But would it not be an economy?

MR. MEYSEY THOMPSON: Seeing there are so many complaints of overtaxation I am prepared——

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to make a speech.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Will the hon. Gentleman give this matter his best consideration, in view of the fact that the present Government claim to be temperance reformers?

[No Answer was returned.]

Dockyard Territorials.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in the event of any large proportion of the men employed in naval dockyards joining the Territorial Army, he is satisfied that on mobilisation of that force the efficiency of the Navy will not be affected by the withdrawal of these men from their ordinary duties.

MR. LAMBERT: The Admiralty have the first claim on the services of all men employed in the royal dockyards, and any who belong to the Territorial Army would not leave their work on the mobilisation of that force unless the Admiralty were satisfied that they could be spared.

MR. ASHLEY: Has the Admiralty informed the War Office authorities that in the event of mobilisation a certain portion of the Territorial Force will not be available?

MR. LAMBERT: I expect the War Office are aware of the facts.

MR. BELLAIRS: But is not the Admiralty perfectly well aware that the services of these men could not possibly be spared? Would they not be performing a far more important duty by repairing ships?

MR. LAMBERT: I can only repeat that they will not be allowed to leave their work unless the Admiralty is satisfied that they can be spared.

Territorial Artillery Battery Adjutants.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of having adjutants from the Regular Army for the Territorial Artillery batteries; and whether, with a view of saving the expense incurred thereby, he will reduce the number of Territorial batteries so as to balance the expense incurred by such adjutants.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. ACLAND, Yorkshire, Richmond): This Question of the proportion of adjutants necessary for the Territorial Artillery has been very fully considered and it was held that one adjutant per brigade of Field Artillery and one per battery of Horse Artillery was sufficient.

MR. ASHLEY put two Supplementary Questions, both of which were inaudible.

The Thakur Bahadur Singh.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Thakur Bahadur Singh, a noble of the State of Bikanir, was dismissed arbitrarily from the office of member of the Bikanir State Council in the year 1905, and ordered to reside under surveillance in his house in the city of Bikanir; that he was brought before the Maharajah of that State on 6th April last, and, without any charge being framed or furnished to him, deported from the State and placed in confinement in the neighbouring State of Jaipur, and that he is still kept in confinement there, without trial or investigation of any sort; and whether inquiries will be instituted by the Government into these matters in order that justice may be secured.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): Thakur Bahadur Singh was removed from the Bikanir State Council in consequence of the part played by him in the events which led to the mprisonment of three leading Thakurs of the State in January, 1905. The condition of residence in the town of Bikanir was imposed upon the Thakur in 1888, when he was permitted to return to the Bikanir State, from which he had been expelled five years previously for rebellion against the State. In November, 1907, the Maharajah of Bikanir represented that Thakur Bahadur Singh had violated the conditions on which he had been permitted to return to Bikanir, and had been taking part in intrigues against the State. His Highness, therefore, proposed that the Thakur should again be banished from Bikanir, and the Government of India gave their assent to this course in March, 1908. I have no information as to the arrangements made for the Thakur's residence outside the Bikanir State. The case in these circumstances does not seem to the Secretary of State one for inquiry.

The Thakur Ram Singh.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Thakur Ram Singh, a noble of the State of Bikanir, was not released from his imprisonment in August, 1906, nor were his estates restored to him, but that he was merely brought out of the fort at Bikanir and detained in that City, that he was not allowed to go outside the city limits or permitted to go to his village, or to hold communication with anyone, and that his estate is still in the hands of the Courts of Wards of the Bikanir Raj, no accounts being furnished to him; will he say whether he is still so detained and forbidden even to execute a power of attorney in favour of any person to conduct his case before the authorities, or to represent him in the matter of his grievances; and whether inquiries by the Government of India will be ordered to secure that justice may be done.

MR. BUCHANAN: My information is that Thakur Ram Singh was released in August, 1906, but I have no knowledge of any conditions as to place of residence, etc., attached to his release. As regards his landed property, one village was confiscated in 1905, and the rest of his estate was placed under the management of the Court of Wards of the Bikanir State, until such time as he should have satisfied the State that he had reformed his chraacter and attitude towards the State, or until his son should have attained his majority. The confiscated village has, I understand, been restored, but I have no information as to whether the conditions necessary for the return of the estates from the management of the Court of Wards have been fulfilled. As stated in reply to a question by the hon. Member on 17th March last, the circumstances are not such as to justify a departure from the established policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of a native State.

*MR. REES: I wish to ask whether incidents such as those brought to notice in this native State are not characteristic of rule according to native ideas and methods such as the hon. Member and his friends profess to desire to see adopted in British India?

MR. BUCHANAN: The policy of the Government of India is not to interfere with native States in conducting their affairs in accordance with ideas which prevail in native India.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): Is it not the case that this particular incident required to be confirmed by His Majesty's Government?

MR. BUCHANAN: Certainly.

Transvaal Mines—Mortality among Labourers.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the death-rate per 1,000 during the first five months of 1908 among the Chinese, all natives and natives from north of 22° south latitude, respectively, who were employed in the Transvaal mines.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): We are not in possession of later figures than those contained in the recent Parliamentary Paper, Cd. 4120.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Will the hon. Gentleman apply for the information?

COLONEL SEELY: I do not think we can do that. The Transvaal Government have assured us that they are taking every step possible to reduce the mortality, and seeing that the results of their action are eminently satisfactory, I think it would be an unwarrantable interference with a self-governing Colony to take such action as is proposed by the hon. Member.

British Honduras—Railway Project.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received from British Honduras a petition expressing the desire of the community that His Majesty's Government should facilitate the construction of a railway westward from Belize; and when he will lay Papers giving the views of His Majesty's Government upon the whole question of railway construction in the Colony.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State has just received the petition referred to by the hon. Member, and it is now under his consideration. In the present position of the matter it would be premature to lay Papers, but the question of doing so will be duly considered hereafter.

British Guiana Militia.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the circular letter to all heads of departments issued from the Government secretary's office of British Guiana under date 6th May, 1908, in which the Governor calls for certain quarterly returns, commencing from 1st July, relating to the attendance of junior officers in the public service of the Colony at drill in connection with the local Militia or Volunteer forces; whether the circular is to be interpreted as calculated to penalise the position of young officers in the service who fail to fulfil the requirements laid down by the Governor to introduce a species of compulsory military service; whether its terms are inconsistent with the Colonial Office Regulations governing appointments in the Crown Colonies, as also with the British Guiana Militia Ordinance of 1891, which makes provision for the recruiting of the ranks of the Militia when the strength falls below the statutory standard; and whether, in the circumstances, instructions will be issued to the Governor of British Guiana to have the circular forthwith cancelled and withdrawn.

COLONEL SEELY: The Secretary of State has no information with regard to the circular referred to, but will make inquiry of the Governor.

Crown Service and Old-Age Pensions.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can recommend that any man who has served His Majesty either in the Volunteer Navy or in the Territorial Army for a term of years shall be considered eligible for an old-age pension so far as character is concerned, without any further inquiry.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): There is no disqualification in respect of character except for actual criminality, and the only test for the purpose of which service in the forces of the Crown could in practice be taken into account is the industry test contained in paragraph (*b*) of Clause 3 subsection 1, of the Bill. The matter was carefully considered when that paragraph was drafted, but it did not appear to be possible to treat what would in many cases be only a short period of such service performed early in life as conclusive evidence of an applicant's industrial character without any regard to his history during the subsequent period beween his leaving the service and applying for a pension.

London Police Holidays.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is yet in a position to grant to the police the same privilege as is accorded to postmen, of fourteen days leave in the year.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): My hon. friend will be aware that a Select Committee appointed to consider the question of granting a weekly rest day to police forces is now sitting. I am not, therefore, prepared to answer the Question until that Committee has presented its Report.

Regent Circus Flower Girls.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the flower girls in Regent Circus have been ordered by the police to quit that place; and, if so, who authorised such an order, and for what reason.

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir, the flower girls in Regent Circus have not yet been ordered by the police to quit that place. The police have had no occasion to take action in the matter.

Motor Vehicle Speeds.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will consider the advisability of making a regulation that all mechanically-driven vehicles, such as motors, motor-omnibuses, and electric trams, shall carry speedometers, in view of the fact that drivers of such vehicles, in the absence of any such apparatus, can only guess the speed at which they are travelling, many drivers having been summoned and punished, and in some cases had their licences withdrawn, for exceeding speed limits.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have considered this question and consulted the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, but have not, so far, thought it desirable to impose the use of speedometers as the condition of the grant of a public carriage licence. The hon. Member may recollect that the Royal Commission on Motor Cars stated, on page 14 of their Report, that they could not recommend making the use of these appliances compulsory by law. Drivers of motor omnibuses, at any rate, cannot exceed the speed limit of twelve miles per hour fixed for their vehicles without knowing it, since to do so they must consciously make an excessive use of the accelerator. My jurisdiction in this matter extends only to public carriages in London. Other motor vehicles would be dealt with by Regulations under the Motor-Car Act.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Is not twelve miles an hour an excessive speed in the streets of London?

MR. GLADSTONE: I do not know that it is an excessive speed, but it is often exceeded.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Has the right hon. Gentleman received any applications from local authorities to vary the speed limit?

*MR. SPEAKER: That hardly arises out of the Question.

Vehicular Routes.

MR. CARR-GOMM (Southwark, Rotherhithe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether at the present time the Commissioners of Police of the Metropolis and the City of London find it possible to carry out any of the provisions of the Section 11 of the Metropolitan Streets Act, 1867, which deal with the control of the routes of vehicles; and, if not, whether he will state the reason for this failure of the Act.

MR. GLADSTONE: The Commissioners of the Metropolitan and City Police report to me that the section is practically inoperative. The difficulty in making use of it to control the routes of vehicles arises, first, from the fact that it applies only to those streets which are within the special limits of the Act; and, secondly, from the proviso in the section that the number of Metropolitan stage carriages that may pass down any street in pursuance of their ordinary trade cannot be limited. I may refer my hon. friend on this subject to Paragraph 166 of the Report of the Royal Commission on London Traffic.

The Woman Suffragists.

Sir J. BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) asked the Home Secretary whether he was considering the advisability of according to the women who were arrested on Tuesday outside the House treatment as first-class misdemeanants, and whether he was also considering the advisability of taking them into safe custody until the House had risen, and thus avoid giving them the notoriety they desired.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I have had no notice of the Questions.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is it not a fact that these ladies are simply agitating for the passage of the Bill which has passed its Second Reading by an enormous majority in this House?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I cannot be responsible for that.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Well, if you pass a Bill you ought to go on with it.

Thames Conservancy—Public Rights on the Upper Thames.

Mr. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in any legislation affecting the Upper Thames, in view of the fact that the Thames Conservancy are a nominated body and not directly representative of those who chiefly use the river, and of the importance of the public rights involved, the Government will consider the advisability of providing for the responsibility of the Board to some Department of the Government in all matters affecting the protection of any public right.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Churchill, Dundee): The Bill which is now being considered by a Joint Committee of the two Houses will establish an authority, which I hope will include representatives of those who use the river. The new authority will have power under the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, to make bye-laws subject to the approval of the Board of Trade for regulating the use and enjoyment of the river, and they will be empowered to apply to Parliament if they find that their powers for this purpose are insufficient. I am advised that it would not be practicable to deal directly with the question of public rights in the present Bill.

Mr. MORRELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the new body will still be a nominated body, and would there not be a strong case for making it responsible to a Government Department?

Mr. CHURCHILL: The general character of the body is indicated in the Bill which is now being considered. As to whether any alteration should be made in the different proportions of which that body is composed, that is a matter which may well be held over for future consideration. The general character of the body may be regarded as defined in the Bill.

Mr. MORRELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that on the south bank of the Thames, between Cleeve Lock and Streatley, there are notice boards stating that the Conservancy pay rent for the use of the bank as a towpath and that the public have no right to use the bank as a footpath except by permission; whether, before the erection of these notices, the inhabitants of Streatley and the public generally used this path to reach Cleeve Lock and the ferry at the Leather Bottel; whether he is aware that this is the only path by which the lock and the ferry can be reached from Streatley; what is the amount of rent paid by the Conservancy, and at what date they began to pay it; and whether the Government will take steps, in connection with any legislation affecting the Upper Thames, to protect the public in the use of the banks as footpaths wherever such use has occurred, and rights of way have been acquired by long user, in addition to rights of towing.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am informed by the Thames Conservancy that the notices referred to in the Question have been erected by the owner of the towpath on his own property. I have no information as to the former use by the public of the path or as to the access to the lock and ferry. I am informed that the yearly rent paid by the Conservancy is 2d. per rod for a distance of several hundred yards, and it has been paid ever since 1866, when the Conservators took over the control of the river above Staines. I am advised that questions of rights of way could not properly be dealt with by the Bill which is now under consideration.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the frequent disputes that have arisen in consequence of the attempt to restrict portions of the towpath along the Thames to those persons who are engaged in navigation of the river, and the difficulty of ascertaining when there is or is not an ancient right of way along the bank in addition to the right of towing; and whether the Government will consider the advisability of introducing legislation to secure the right of any person to walk along the towpath, whether towing a boat or not.

MR. CHURCHILL: Questions as to rights of way do not come under the jurisdiction of the Board of Trade, and my attention has not been hitherto called to the disputes referred to. I understand that in many cases the towpaths of the River Thames are private property, subject to a right of use by any persons for towing vessels. I will give careful consideration to any concrete proposals that may be submitted to me for attaining the object at which my hon. friend aims, but I am advised it is not practicable to deal with the matter in the Bill now before a Joint Committee.

MR. MORRELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of dealing with that in another Bill so as to secure some such control of the Upper Thames for the public as exists in the case of the lower Thames?

MR. CHURCHILL: This Bill creates an authority for the upper river.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that on the north bank of the Thames, at Mapledurham, a notice board has recently been erected prohibiting landing without permission and signed J. D. B.; whether, at the request of the gentleman who erected it, and who is himself a Conservator of the Thames, the Conservators have given orders to the lock-keeper at Mapledurham not to ferry people across to this point as had been done by the lock-keeper at a small charge for more than twenty years previously; and whether, in view of the fact that this has been always regarded as a public crossing between the parishes of Purley and Mapledurham, and that any foot-passengers between these parishes are now obliged to go round by Caversham, an extra distance of nearly six miles, he will cause a full inquiry to be made into the action of the Thames Conservancy in this matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am informed by the Thames Conservancy that the notice board referred to is not on land over which the Conservators have rights or control, and that the Conservators have not objected to the lock-keeper when not engaged on his duties conveying authorised persons over the river. The Board of Trade have no authority to decide whether there is or is not a public right of way, and I have, therefore, no power to cause an inquiry to be made as suggested.

MR. MORRELL: Can the right hon. Gentleman explain the meaning of the term "authorised persons"?

MR. CHURCHILL: Some doubt has occurred to my mind, and I have asked for information on the point.

MR. BYLES: Will the newly-created body have any power whatever with regard to public rights and private enclosures?

MR. CHURCHILL: That question of protecting public rights against private enclosures does not arise in the present Bill, which merely sets up the authority.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Will the upper river body have the same powers as the Thames Conservancy?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, and the question is whether wider powers shall not be granted to the new body.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the fact that the Thames Conservancy are frequently reluctant to give full information upon matters that come within their knowledge, and that when recently asked by a Member of this House to produce the correspondence that had passed between themselves and a parish council they replied by asking to what use the information would be put, he will take steps to see that Members of this House shall have proper access to all documents and correspondence in the possession of the Thames Conservancy relating to any matters of public interest.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have no knowledge of the alleged action of the Thames Conservancy, and I am not advised that the Board of Trade have any power to require them to produce documents and correspondence.

MR. MORRELL: Are not the Board of Trade represented on the Thames Conservancy?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, but I was speaking of the action of the Conservancy as a whole.

MR. MORRELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman instruct his representative to allow me to see the correspondence?

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

MR. CHURCHILL: I shall be very glad to give the hon. Member all the information I can.

Nottingham Bankruptcy.

MR. RICHARDSON (Nottingham, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that George Henry Taylor, of Kyte Street, Nottingham, filed his petition in bankruptcy in November, 1885, and paid 11d. in the £., his liabilities being between £4,000 and £5,000; that in March, 1907, he called his creditors together and through the Official Receiver paid them the balance £3,917 1s. 2d., 19s. 1d. in the £.; whether he is aware that cheques to the amount of £146 15s. 7d. were returned to the Official Receiver marked not known, and that the Official Receiver has paid over this £146 15s. 7d. to the Board of Trade, to whom Mr. Taylor has made application for repayment, but is refused on technical grounds; and will he take such measures as will enable Mr. Taylor to secure this money.

MR. CHURCHILL: The facts are as stated by my hon. friend, except that claims amounting to upwards of £50 have now been made on the undistributed balance mentioned. The Board of Trade are in the position of trustees for the creditors in respect of any such balance and are under statutory obligation, without limitation of time, to hold the amount at the disposal of the creditors concerned, who have proved in the bankruptcy upon their establishing the claims to be undistributed dividend. I have no power to enable Mr. Taylor to secure the money in question.

MR. RICHARDSON: But could not the Board of Trade release the money if the debtor gave security for its payment in case of necessity?

MR. CHURCHILL: I am advised by legal authorities that I have not that power.

Companies (Consolidation) Bill.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): On behalf of the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will print and circulate with the Parliamentary Papers a Memorandum showing the alterations in the existing Law which it is proposed to effect in the Companies (Consolidation) Bill.

MR. CHURCHILL: No alteration or amendment of the existing law is contemplated by the Bill to consolidate the Companies Acts. The Bill, as the hon. Baronet is aware, has been referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses, who will examine the details of the Bill, and I hope eventually to report that it accurately represents the existing law.

British Patents—The New Act.

MR. TIMOTHY DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has received representations from owners of British patents worked abroad to extend the time when they will be expected to have such patents adequately worked in the United Kingdom for one year or more beyond the period laid down in the Patents Act (Amendment), 1907; and if he has received such representations, what answers has he given them.

MR. CHURCHILL: No representations of the nature of those referred to by the hon. Member have been received.

MR. TIMOTHY DAVIES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the number of patents worked in foreign countries which are affected by the Patents Act, 1907; how many of such patents are worked in the United States of America, Germany, and France respectively; does he anticipate any difficulties in carrying out the provisions of the Act; and can he state how many owners of such patents are already building factories or have taken or are about to take land to build factories in the United Kingdom in order to comply with the law.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Board of Trade have no information as to the number of patents worked in foreign countries that may be affected by the provisions of Section 27 of the Act referred to, nor have they any record of the number of the owners of such patents who are building or about to build factories in this country, though the number is no doubt considerable. I see no reason to anticipate that difficulties are likely to arise in carrying out the provisions of the section.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that German manufacturers have petitioned their Government to obtain, if possible by diplomatic means, an extension of the time-limit, under Section 27 of the Patents Act of last year, under which, unless a patentee makes use of his grant to an adequate extent within the United Kingdom within a year, it may be revoked; and whether the Board of Trade will resist any attempt to secure an extension of the time-limit.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have seen such statements in the Press, but have no official information. No change in the date on which Section 27 comes into operation could be made without further legislation.

Industrial Life in Germany—Price of Rye Bread.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that on page 37 of the Report on certain conditions of industrial life in Germany, under the heading of price of rye bread per lb., the prices given are those per 4 lb.; and whether, seeing that the effect of this misstatement is to represent bread as costing four times as much in Germany as in England, he will take steps to have the error corrected.

MR. CHURCHILL: My attention has been called to the unfortunate omission by a clerical error of the figure "4" in the heading of one of the tables on page 37 of the General Report, which gives the price per lb. of rye bread in certain towns in Germany. I have already caused a corrected page to be issued. I would, however, point out that the prices of bread in Germany are given correctly elsewhere in the Volume.

MR. LONSDALE: Will the right hon. Gentleman take care to send a copy of this Answer to the Liberal Publication Department?

MR. CHURCHILL: Does the hon. Gentleman intend to suggest that the publication of this was intended to deceive?

MR. LONSDALE: My Question is simply, will the right hon. Gentleman send a copy of the corrected Answer to the Liberal Publication Department?

MR. CHURCHILL: I see no reason for establishing any special connection between the Statistical Department of the Board of Trade and the Publication Department of any Party.

Speedometers on Tramways.

MR. BOWERMAN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that in the regulations and bye-laws dated 5th March, 1907, to govern electrical tramway traction in London, power is given to the Board to insist that every motor-carriage used on the tramways shall be fitted, if and when required by the Board of Trade, with an apparatus to indicate to the driver the speed at which it is running; whether such regulation has been put into force; and, if not, whether he will state the reason for the delay in carrying it into effect.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am aware that there is such a Regulation, but the fitting of speed indicators on tramcars has not hitherto been required, as no satisfactory appliance of the kind was available, so far as was known to the Board of Trade. I am, however, now advised that the time has come when the matter should be further considered, and I propose to communicate with the London County Council and the corporations of other large cities on the subject.

Bay of Firth Oyster Fisheries.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has powers under Section 5 of The Fisheries (Oyster, Crab, and Lobster) Act, 1877, to prohibit, restrict, and regulate the fishing of oysters at the Bay of Firth, in Orkney; whether if the Oyster and Mussel Fishery (Bay of Firth) Provisional Order Confirmation Bill, which is designed to create a several oyster fishery over an area of about 4,500 acres for a period of sixty years, becomes law, he will be precluded from exercising his powers under that section over that area while that Order is in force, and the only remedy in the event of that fishery not being conducted satisfactorily will be to repeal the Order by a certificate under Section 45 of the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, under which Act the Provisional Order Bill is being promoted; and why the creation of a private monopoly in this public oyster fishery under the Act of 1868 is preferred to the regulation of it, in the interests of the public, under the Act of 1877.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The Secretary for Scotland has power under Section 5 of the Sea Fisheries (Oyster, Crab, and Lobster) Act, 1877, to prohibit, restrict, and regulate the fishing of oysters, but that power does not extend to places where a several oyster fishery is constituted by Order under the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, the remedy for unsatisfactory administration in such cases being as stated by my hon. friend. Mere prohibition, restriction, or regulation would now have little effect in resuscitating the beds at the Bay of Firth. What is wanted is the cultivation of the beds on approved modern methods, and neither the Secretary for Scotland nor the Fishery Board have powers or funds for this purpose. Every effort to get local public bodies to take up the matter failed, and the Fishery Board were compelled to fall back on the proposal for a public syndicate. I am informed that no public interest is being violated, while, on the other hand, the operations of the syndicate will afford employment to a number of the local people.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE: Will the Bill referred to be taken to-night?

MR. SINCLAIR: I understand that it will be postponed.

Insanitation at Stornoway.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state why the Report on the sanitary condition of Stornoway is not obtainable by Members of this House, seeing that a similar Report on the sanitary condition of the Lews issued when the late Government was in office was readily available.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Report referred to by my hon. friend is of a different character from the former Report on the sanitary condition of the Lews to which my hon. friend alludes, and it is not considered necessary to give it the same publicity.

*Mr. REES: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the people of Stornoway have twice held indignation meetings to protest against the insanitary character attributed by the hon. Member to their sanitary and salubrious island?

Mr. WEIR: I have had numerous communications showing that the hon. Member knows nothing about the matter.

*Mr. REES: But I can supply proof of what I have said.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I shall be glad to have any information.

Highland Crofts and Deer Forests.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the need for land by crofters and cottars in the Highland crofting counties, will steps be taken to prevent land which is suitable for profitable occupation by the people being converted into deer forest, especially bearing in mind that in recent years some of the best arable land in the Highlands has been thus taken for deer.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend is already aware of the land policy of the Government which would have made further land available for occupation by the people, and I am not able to make any further pronouncement at the present time.

Congestion in Lewis.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that it is now upwards of four years since the Scottish Office informed the Lewis district committee that the only way of dealing with the cottar difficulty was by a scheme of voluntary migration to the mainland, will he explain why he has made no effort to acquire land for the development of some such scheme, especially bearing in mind that a considerable time has elapsed since he was furnished with a list of Lewis cottars who are anxious to migrate to the mainland.

I beg also to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that it is now upwards of four years since the Scottish Office informed the Lewis district committee that the only way of dealing with the cottar difficulty was by a scheme of voluntary migration to the mainland, and of the statement of the Secretary for Scotland that he saw a difficulty in finding crofters and cottars at once both desirous to migrate and possessed of the requisite qualification, will he state briefly the qualifications required of cottar migrants; and will he say if any effort has yet been made to ascertain the qualifications of the numerous cottars on the list, furnished to him some time since, of those willing to migrate to the mainland.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In reply to these Questions I have nothing to add to the Answers given to my hon. friend on 22nd and 23rd June. In the meantime the matter lies with the Landward Committee.

Mr. WEIR: I should be obliged if the right hon. Gentleman would not shunt me on to the Landward Committee. The right hon. Gentleman must know——

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member must know he is not entitled to make a speech.

Mr. WEIR: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of looking into this matter himself, and not giving me Answers of this character?

*Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to put his Question in a courteous way, and when he receives a reply not to comment on it.

Mr. WEIR: In consequence of the unsatisfactory reply I have received I beg to give notice that I shall take the earliest opportunity of calling attention to the negligence of the right hon. Gentleman.

Sutherland Main Roads.

Mr. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether any arrangements have yet been made for making a grant to the Sutherland County Council towards the cost of making up and widening the main roads.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Answer is in the negative.

Mr. MORTON: When will this matter be considered?

Mr. SINCLAIR asked for notice of any further Questions, and added that the hon. Member must be aware from the previous Answers that the matter could only be dealt with in a general scheme.

Mr. MORTON reminded the right hon. Gentleman that he had as yet sent no answer to the deputation which waited on him on the subject some months ago.

Old Shoremore Harbour.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether anything has yet been done to improve the harbour at Old Shoremore, Kinlochbervie, Sutherlandshire, so that the fishermen may use it with safety and for their protection.

Mr. SINCLAIR: As I have already informed my hon. friend, the Congested Districts Board, after full consideration, do not feel justified in making a grant in aid of the work indicated.

Embo Pier, Sutherlandshire.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether anything has yet been done to improve the pier at Embo, Sutherlandshire, so that the fishermen can use it for the protection of their lives and boats; and, if not, will he see that something is done for the protection of life and property.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have nothing to add to my reply to my hon. friend on 28th May, 1907, when I informed him that the Congested Districts Board hold that the position of the local fishing industry does not justify them in spending further public money on this pier.

Mr. MORTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman endeavour to induce the Congested Districts Board to do something to protect these fishermen?

[No Answer was returned.]

Port Skerra Pier, Sutherland.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can say whose duty it is to improve and enlarge the pier at Port Skerra, Sutherland; and whether he will see that this pier is improved, so as to be of use to the fishermen in the district.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The obligation to maintain the pier lies with the county council, but it is not obligatory on anyone to improve or enlarge it.

Illegal Trawling in the Moray Firth.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that on Wednesday and Thursday, the 17th and 18th instant, eight trawlers were at work in the Moray Firth near Helmsdale; that some of them were at work within the three-mile limit; whether he is aware that at night these trawlers were at work in Loth Bay; and can he say whether there are any fishery cruisers on duty in the Moray Firth, and, if so, where are they.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Board have had no complaints regarding illegal trawling about the dates mentioned in my hon. friend's Question, but on the 19th instant the "Viking" was reported for illegal trawling within the three-mile limit off Lybster by the commander of the "Ringdove," and the case has been reported to the Procurator-Fiscal at Wick. As to the position of the fishery cruisers, I do not think it expedient to give details.

Fishing Rights in Scotland.

Mr. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in view of the fact that forty years continuous use of a footpath gives the public a prescriptive right to use, commonly called a right of way, he would bring forward legislation to make the same principle apply to any river in the Lowlands of Scotland which has been continuously fished for the same length of time without let or hindrance from the landed proprietor.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): The exclusion in recent years of the public from fishing over considerable stretches of water has brought into greater prominence the question of the possible acquisition by the public of such rights of access and fishing by prescriptive use or otherwise. My hon. friend quite rightly alludes to the relation which such acquisition bears to the whole question of rights of way. These questions so related have for some time been receiving the careful consideration of the Government. The point as to future legislation does not fall within my Department, and any Question on the subject should be addressed to the Prime Minister.

Clonakilty Evicted Tenants.

MR. E. BARRY (Cork County, S.) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have refused to take further action in the reinstatement of Philip Hayes, evicted tenant, in the farm at Ballyvackey, Clonakilty, from which he was evicted; and, if so, on what grounds have they rejected his claim for reinstatement.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The Estates Commissioners have decided that they cannot take any action to procure the reinstatement of Philip Hayes in the holding which his father surrendered in September, 1886. The compulsory provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907, cannot be applied in this case, and the owner refuses to sell the lands.

Bustard Estate, Donegal.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that representations were made to the Estates Commissioners in October, 1907, and in June, 1908, that the owner of the Bustard estate, situate in the electoral divisions of Inver and Dunkineely, County Donegal, was willing to sell the property through the Estates Commissioners; as this estate, outside the tenants' holdings, comprises 1,449 acres of untenanted land in the owner's possession what steps, if any, did the Commissioners take to interview the owner or inspect the property; and whether, having regard to the fact that this grazing tract is urgently needed to relieve congestion in the district and give some land to the landless fishermen and others in these electoral divisions, measures will be promptly instituted to expedite the sale.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners received representations made to them on behalf of the tenants in December, 1907, and June, 1908. So far back as July, 1907, the Commissioners communicated with the owner offering to inspect the untenanted land on the estate with a view to purchase, and have since addressed him on several occasions, but have received no reply. The Commissioners do not consider that they can take any further steps in the matter at present. If the owner is willing to sell his tenanted and untenanted land, as suggested in the Question, he should institute formal proceedings before the Commissioners.

Carrick-on-Shannon Cattle-drive.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received information that it is intended to loot the cattle on the Kiltogert Farm, near Carrick-on-Shannon; whether he has been informed that this threat is due to the withdrawal of the charges against the men who were proceeded against for driving cattle on this farm on Easter Monday; whether the owner has informed him of the steps he proposes to take to protect his property in default of receiving any protection from the law; and what action will the Government take in the matter.

MR. CHERRY: My right hon. friend has received a letter from the owner of a fourth part of this property, in which the writer states that he has received information that, as a result of the withdrawal of the previous charges, it is intended to loot the cattle on the farm in question, and that in such event he intends to take certain strong measures for the protection of his property. My right hon. friend has already informed the hon. Member that the former case was not proceeded with because there had been no renewal of cattle-driving in the locality. This course was adopted in the interests of the peace of the locality. Up to the present there has been no case of cattle-driving from the farm since that which occurred two and a half months ago. The police authorities inform me that, so far as they are aware, no threat to loot the cattle has been made. The police, however, are affording constant protection to the property of the gentleman referred to.

MR. LONSDALE: And in the event of another attempt being made to drive these cattle, may we take it that the gentleman referred to will be justified in taking the steps he suggests?

MR. CHERRY: I do not say anything of the kind. I do not know what steps he proposes.

Cattle-drives.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is able to give any facts to the House to show that the practice of binding to be of good behaviour is having any effect in diminishing the number of cattle-drives.

MR. CHERRY: The number of cattle-drives in the month of June is considerably less than the number in May, but how far this may be due to the fact that persons have been bound to the peace for cattle-driving is a matter of opinion. The police authorities inform me that in two or three instances only have persons who were bound to the peace been again found driving cattle.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many cattle-drives have been reported by the police during the six months ending 27th June, in how many of these cases have accused persons been put on their trial before common juries, and how many convictions have been obtained.

MR. CHERRY: The number of cattle-drives reported during the period in question was 413. In none of the cases were accused persons put on trial before a common jury.

MR. LONSDALE: Does the right hon. Gentleman intend to abolish trial by jury in Ireland?

MR. CHERRY: No, Sir.

MR. LONSDALE: Does the right hon. Gentleman now recognise the fact that trial by jury in agrarian cases in Ireland is a farce?

MR. CHERRY: No, Sir. Nothing of the kind.

Moate Cattle-drive.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case heard at Trim Quarter Sessions on Thursday, when compensation was awarded for injury done to forty bullocks and heifers, driven off the lands of Captain Fowler, D.L., near Moate on 9th May; whether he is aware that the evidence showed that the cattle were driven over a six-foot fence, across ploughed land, through a river, and over a barbed-wire fence, which cut several of the animals, that the Judge said he was told that these cattle-drives were an innocent form of amusement, and the cattle were only driven gently along the roads, and that he wished those who held that opinion had heard the evidence of the dastardly manner in which these animals were treated; and whether any persons were punished for the cruelty perpetrated in this instance.

MR. CHERRY: In the case in question the County Court Judge awarded the sum of £21 as compensation for the injury to the cattle. I understand that the evidence given during the hearing of the case, and the remarks of the County Court Judge, were substantially as stated in the Question. I am informed by the police authorities that it was not possible to make any person amenable in the case owing to the lack of evidence.

Dundrum Estate Cattle-drive.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the award by Judge Moore of £200 to the Messrs. Hickey, as compensation for injury to cattle driven off grazing lands on the Dundrum estate; whether people who had driven off the cattle have since been put in possession of the lands by the Estates Commissioners; and, if so, will he explain why this has been done in view of the pledge given to a deputation on 13th December last, and since repeated in the House of Commons, that persons who took part in cattle-drives would not share in the division of the lands.

Mr. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the cattle-drive referred to in the Question took place after the purchasers had been selected by them. The Commissioners are not aware that any of the purchasers were actually engaged in the driving of the cattle, and, so far as their information goes, no persons have been prosecuted in connection with the matter.

Foreign Office Vote.

Dr. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will state when the Foreign Office Vote will be taken again.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): No date can yet be fixed for the further consideration of the Foreign Office Vote.

Sugar Convention Additional Act.

Mr. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can now state whether any one, and, if so, which, of the contracting States signatories of The Sugar Convention Additional Act, 1907, with the sole exception of Great Britain, has ratified that Act without previously obtaining the assent of its Parliament; and are His Majesty's Government advised that they have greater powers than the Governments of either Belgium, Holland, Sweden, France, or Germany to agree, without Parliamentary assent, to international compacts affecting the trade of the country and its supply of sugar.

Mr. ASQUITH: I can add nothing to the answer given by me on 3rd June. It has never been the constitutional practice to submit commercial treaties to Parliament except in the conditions explained in my answer, none of which apply to the present case. I may add that the decision of His Majesty's Government in regard to the Sugar Convention was announced to this House more than twelve months ago.

The Navy Estimates.

Mr. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the Report stages of Vote A. and Vote 1 of the Navy Estimates were allowed to go through at a late hour of the night on 19th March as a result of an agreement that Vote 5 of the Navy Estimates would be placed first on the Order Paper at an early date; and whether he can now state in what manner he proposes to carry out this undertaking, so that the question of training of naval officers and the engine-room *personnel* can be adequately discussed.

Mr. ASQUITH: I recognise that an intimation was given to the House that an opportunity would be afforded for the further consideration of Vote 5 of the Navy Estimates, and I am proposing to place that Vote, and Votes 14, 13, and 15 on the Order Paper next week, probably Wednesday. I am hoping that not more than half a day will be devoted to the discussion of these Navy Votes.

Mr. BELLAIRS: Will the Vote be brought on immediately after the Questions as promised by the First Lord?

Mr. ASQUITH: I am not acquainted with the terms of the promise, but I think it will be first.

Mr. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): Is Vote 5 to be taken on this half-day?

Mr. ASQUITH: Yes, Sir. I do not think Votes 13, 14 and 15 will take much time.

Scottish Estimates—Debate on Trawling.

Mr. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the question of foreign trawlers is exciting great interest in Scotland; and whether, therefore, he will arrange that, on the further half-day to be allotted to Scottish Estimates, the Fishery Board Vote shall be taken first.

Mr. MORTON: I beg at the same time to ask the Prime Minister whether he will arrange to give another day for the consideration of the Scottish Estimates, especially with regard to the trawling question.

Mr. BARNES: Shall we have an opportunity of discussing the unemployed question on that Vote?

Mr. ASQUITH: In the event of the Navy Votes alluded to in my reply to the last Question being obtained by about eight o'clock, I am prepared to allot the remainder of the sitting to Scottish Estimates and propose to put down the Fishery Board Vote first.

Mr. BARNES: Will the right hon. Gentleman move the closure at a given time, or will we be expected to make our own arrangement as to the debate.

Mr. ASQUITH: I would rather wait and see how matters develop.

The Budget.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) asked the Prime Minister what had become of the Budget. When did the right hon. Gentleman propose to take the Committee stage of the Finance Bill, and did he propose to take it under the guillotine?

Mr. ASQUITH: The House, by the Second Reading of the Finance Bill, has affirmed all the principles contained in the Budget. The Committee stage of the Finance Bill remains, and will be taken in the usual course, and according to the ordinary methods of procedure.

Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) called the attention of the Speaker to an omission from Votes and Proceedings which were circulated each day among Members; and upon which the journals of the House were based. There was no record of an Amendment moved by him, and accepted by the Government in Committee on the Old-age Pensions Bill yesterday. The Amendment was to leave out the word "payable" and insert the word "receivable." He also thought there was an incorrect entry in Votes and Proceedings in regard to what occurred at the fall of the guillotine. It stated that at half-past ten o'clock the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the order of the House of 17th June, to put forthwith Amendments moved by the Government of which notice had been given. He submitted that those words meant that notice must have been given before half-past ten. There was a considerable amount of excitement at the fall of the guillotine and some misunderstanding; and it was presumed that no notice had been given of one of the Amendments put by the Chairman. Could they have an assurance that notice was duly given? If so, they would be satisfied.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is making a general speech. What is his point?

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he desired to know whether he would be in order in moving that this omission and error in Votes and Proceedings be rectified.

Mr. SPEAKER: In other words, the hon. Member is appealing from the decision of the Chairman of Ways and Means to me on the second point.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: Not exactly, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: In regard to that point, it is quite clear that I have no control whatever over what occurred in Committee; and I presume the Chairman would not have put the Question unless he was acting, or thought he was acting, under the direction of the House as contained in the order which the hon. Member quoted. With regard to the first Question, I think the hon.

Member is in error in supposing that the Votes and Proceedings are, or attempt to be, a complete record of what occurs in Committee. They are nothing of the kind. There are a great number of Amendments which are never recorded in the Votes and Proceedings. The only record of such Amendments is to be found in the amended Bill itself. The only Amendments recorded in the Votes and Proceedings are those which terminate in a division of the Committee, and those under consideration when progress is reported. But in the case of Amendments which are accepted by the Committee or withdrawn no record is kept in the Votes and Proceedings. The attempt to keep such a record would be a novel course and would encumber the Votes and Proceedings. If the hon. Member wishes to alter the Votes and Proceedings in any respect, he can do so by giving notice and moving when he gets the opportunity.

Mr. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: I desire to thank you, Sir, for your Answer.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Fifth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Infant Life Protection (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Montgomery and (in respect of the University of Durham Bill) Mr. Scarisbrick; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Infant Life Protection (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Crosfield; and (in respect of the University of Durham Bill): Mr. Lyulph Stanley.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Coroners (Ireand) Bill): Mr. Edward Barry, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Lardner, Mr. Muldoon, and Mr. James O'Connor; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. Charles MacVeigh, Mr. Patrick White, Mr. Meagher, Mr. John Phillips, and Mr. Hogan.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL REGISTRATION OF TITLE (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

Reported without Amendment, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 205].

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 205.]

Bill to be taken into consideration to-morrow.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Pembroke, in the room of John Wynford Phillipps, esquire, Chiltern Hundreds.—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

NEW BILL.

ISLE OF MAN (CUSTOMS DUTIES) BILL.

"To amend the Law with respect to Customs Duties in the Isle of Man," presented by Mr. Hobhouse; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 289].

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 7:

*The CHAIRMAN said that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Norwood (to leave out subsection (1)), as it referred to the whole of the subsection, would not be in order, because striking out the subsection would be equivalent in this case to striking out the whole clause, and any proposal of that sort ought to come on on the question that the clause stand part.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked when the important questions raised by subsection (1) could be raised—not until the end of the clause?

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said the clause proposed to set up three distinct authorities—the pension committee, the pension officer, and the central authority. As a matter of fact, parts of the clause did hang together, but yet they were separate and distinct. Did he understand it would be impossible to discuss the clause as it stood and the duties of the three officers or bodies created until they reached the end of the clause ?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) said he could quite see the difficulty raised by the Leader of the Opposition, but he did not see that that point could not be raised on the Amendment next on the Paper.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that so far as questions were correlated he always tried not to interfere with proper discussions on them, but as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, in this case the question arose on the next Amendment.

*MR. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock) moved the omission of all the words of the clause after "determined" in the opening sentence, in order to insert "by the pension officer." He said the object of his Amendment was to substitute the pension officer for the pension committee. He thought a considerable feeling existed in the House with regard to the appointment of a local committee of amateurs to control the distribution of State pensions, and he was more particularly opposed to it from the point of view of a Member for an agricultural constituency. He did not think the majority of Members of the House adequately realised the social conditions under which the older and poorer labourers had to live in our country villages. He was well aware that most towns, like Leicester, and some of the country districts, like the West Riding of Yorkshire, could take ample care that fair play was exercised in the composition and conduct of a pension committee, but he would like to ask with all sincerity what they imagined would be the character of such a committee in an average agricultural district of England. It was not an exaggeration to say that such a committee would, in some cases, be saturated with sectarian, political, and social prejudices, prejudices levelled, be it remembered, against the feebler and older labourers. He knew something about it, because he was the son of a country vicar, and he had come into friendly contact with hundreds of labourers. He had no wish to exaggerate a good case, but hon. Members probably saw in the newspapers of yesterday or the day before a case in which an agricultural labourer in the Tonbridge Division of Kent had been evicted from his house, because he had had the audacity to apply for land under the Small Holdings Act—that was the kind of prejudice and petty tyranny to which the labourers might have to submit. Some of these pension committees would probably be recruited from the ranks of small squires, parsons, their wives, who were often worse than themselves, Tory farmers, retired snobs, *et hoc genus omne*. Full play would be given to local gossip, and the members of the committee could make political capital out of the fact that they were the arbiters as to whether a pension was to be bestowed or withheld. It might be said that some check existed against that kind of thing, and that it would be unpopular for any local committee to refuse a man a pension, and so put him on the rates. Many unsuccessful applicants, however, might not go on the rates, but relapse into that state of independent semi-starvation from which if they got the pension they would emerge. The faithful adherents of the Government in the counties frequently lived under singularly oppressive conditions, and he regretted to have to say that to some extent the fetters of this accursed feudalism had been rivetted more firmly than ever by some of the Liberal appointments to the Bench, and by handing over our citizen soldiers to County Associations. If it was thought that it was unfair or unwise to entrust so much power to one individual, an Amendment could be framed and accepted, which would allow an appeal from the decision of the pension officer to the local Bench of magistrates. They had, after all, a sense of responsibility and were, by the expert advice of the magistrates' clerk, kept more or less within the bounds of legal rectitude. A pension officer, of course was a public official, or, to use the more grandiloquent expression of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he was an Imperial officer. He would have local knowledge, he would understand his *metier* thoroughly, and he would be paid by the central authority and be responsible to that authority alone.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 14, to leave out from the word 'determined' to end of the clause, and to insert the words 'by the pension officer.'"—(*Mr. Bennett.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, down to the end of line 14, stand part of the Question."

MR. WALTER LONG said he did not suppose he was speaking alone for Members on his side of the House when he dissociated himself entirely from the speech just delivered, which would have more appropriately found place in a book of ill-natured fairy tales than in the records of the House. The hon. Gentleman had been good enough to take them into his own personal family history, and claimed to be an authority on the subject of squires and country labourers because he was the son of a country rector. Anybody familiar with country life in any part of Great Britain would altogether fail to recognise the description given by the hon. Gentleman as having the smallest relation to what actually occurred in our country districts. Reference had been made more than once by those really conversant with the question to the action of landowners and others in making provision in the form of a pension for their own labourers, and anybody who had studied the question of the present position of the agricultural labourer must know perfectly well that on the estates of the gentlemen so curiously described by the hon. Member for Oxfordshire there was almost invariably to be found a system of pensions by which the old labourers were provided for to the end of their lives, and under which it was never necessary for them to apply to the Poor Law. He was speaking of what he knew from his own personal experience; in almost every case where a village belonged to one or two large owners the number of people found on the Poor Law was infinitesimal. He spoke of some villages where it was the record of the village that no man or woman in the most remote degree connected with the estate had ever been allowed to go on the Poor Law; and that was the kind of thing described by the hon. Gentleman when he sought to get rid of the pension committees. The hon. Gentleman said that an agricultural labourer had been evicted because he applied for a small holding; he did not go into the details or facts of the case. He thought even those who did not believe in the land system of the country would agree with him that, in common fairness, before the owner of that property was condemned he ought to have his case stated, and that they ought not to assume, because the hon. Gentleman gave one single case, without one atom of verification, that therefore he was justified in——

MR. BENNETT: The case occurred in the Tonbridge Division of Kent.

MR. WALTER LONG said it was alleged merely that a man was turned out because he made a particular application. The hon. Gentleman was a distinguished member of one of the Universities, and he would, therefore, know perfectly well the difficulty of proving that an act of an individual was due to one particular cause. It suited him to say the man, whose name they did not know, was turned out because he made a particular application. He did not think that kind of charge would weigh much with the House. It was on totally different grounds that he found himself, with great reluctance, supporting an Amendment moved in such a speech. Owing to the difficulties of the Parliamentary situation he had no other opportunity of considering the question he wanted to bring to the notice of the Government. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had borne with great good humour and patience the heavy burden of carrying through this Bill, had charged some Members of the Opposition with inadequate study of the Bill. That charge had been made against him more than once, but he could assure the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he had read the Bill, he suspected as often as the right hon. Gentleman himself had done, and he was sure as carefully. He wanted to know from the Government whether they attached to the English language a different meaning from that which was given in any dictionary in any bookseller's shop. He ventured to say the other day that the pension committee under this Bill were charged with a particular duty, and he based that view on the language of subsection (*b*)—

> "The pension officer shall inquire into and report upon any claim or question so referred to him, and the local pension committee shall, on the receipt of the report of the pension officer, and after obtaining from him, if necessary, any further information as to the claim in question, consider the case and give their decision upon the claim in question."

Their decision would not require legal interpretation. "Decision" meant a settlement of the case; therefore, he had assumed that the pension committee were intended to hear all the facts as narrated by the pension officer, and then arrive at their decision. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day had pointed out that that was a mistaken view altogether; that the real official in the matter was the pension officer in the first instance—he called him the Imperial officer—and the President of the Local Government Board, through his Department, was also an Imperial officer in the final case. If that were the correct interpretation of the Bill, and of course the Government were necessarily the authority on that point — then he asked for what purpose was the pension committee appointed, and what were the duties they would have to perform? The pension committee was to be appointed as other committees had been appointed in previous Acts of Parliament; that was to say, they were to be members of certain popularly elected bodies, and they were given power to co-opt people from outside. That was the basis on which the education committee of the county council was appointed, the animals diseases committee and certain other committees. It was obviously a very good plan. They got the representative element of elective members of local authorities, and they were able to bring in outsiders who were suitable for the work, and who had the necessary local knowledge. But what was the use of going through this elaborate machinery if, when the committee was appointed, its work was to be limited to approving of the action of the pension officer? The Government might have been very careful in drawing up this clause and its subsections, which defined the limitations under which the Bill was to be applied, but it was unquestionable that there would be great room for a discretionary interpretation of those limitations. But what they were entitled to know before they went further was with whom that discretionary duty was to rest. Was it to rest with the local committee or the pension officer? The hon. Member proposed to abolish the pension committee. If they were to have no discretion, and were merely to act upon the authority of the pension officer, then, in common respect for local government, what was the good of the committee? If the pensions were to be provided by the pension officer on certain conditions set out in the Bill, why go to the trouble of setting up a committee whose duties apparently would be non-existent, and who were merely to ratify the report of the pension officer, which report, if they took the Government's view of their own Bill, was the real decision of the case? What was there left for the pension committee to decide? If they said that in proportion to population there was to be only a limited number of pensions given, if the Government had taken the line that these pensions were to be the reward for exceptional merit in local life, he could have understood that they would discriminate between different candidates. But nothing of the kind was done. What they did was to say that men of a certain age, of a certain income, and fulfilling certain conditions were to be entitled to pensions. The man made his application to the pension committee, and the matter was referred to the pension officer, who made his inquiry and report. What were the inquiry and report upon? The pension officer had to find out whether the statements of the man or woman were correct, and whether he or she conformed to the regulations and conditions of the Bill. Having made his inquiry, the officer reported to the committee. What had the committee to do? There was no option left to them; there was nothing whatever for them to do but to act upon the report of the officer, and give the man or woman the certificate with which to obtain the pension at the post office. Was any body of self-respecting men or women going to act in that manner? If the committee disagreed with the report of the pension officer, what was to happen? The matter was to be referred to the Local Government Board. In his ignorance, when he first read the Bill, he assumed that no Government would appoint a semi-locally elective body without charging them with the duty of decision, together with appeal against their decisions, and that if there were no *mala fides* in their decision it would be upheld by the appellate authority. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer had wiped all that away the other day, and said that they had the Imperial officer, and also the President of the Local Government Board and his officials. If that were so, why have a pension committee at all? They ought to be told what their duties were to be. He did not desire to abolish the pension committee, and his alteration would be of a different kind from that of the hon. Member. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had described the pension officer as an "Imperial officer," but he ventured to say that the people among whom the Excise officer lived would find it very hard to recognise the ordinary revenue officer under the title of Imperial officer. So far as he knew, the revenue officer had never hitherto been regarded as one who was at all familiar with the lives of of the people among whom he lived. To begin with, he usually worked over a large area, and lived in that part of it which he found most convenient for trains or the use of his bicycle. He was absolutely unknown to the life of our poor country villages, and he should have thought that he was the least known of any officials in the towns. And where he was known he was an extremely unpopular and unwelcome visitor. Yet this was the man selected by the Government to make these invidious inquiries. So far he had dealt only with the inquiries which were antecedent to the granting of the pensions; but there was a very much more objectionable duty cast upon the pension officer. He had not only to make inquiries before the granting of the pension, but he had the duty of seeing that the men or women who had received pensions continued to conform to the conditions laid down by the Act. He could not conceive a more odious duty being cast upon any person or a less suitable person than the officer chosen for the purpose. He quite understoood that the Government wanted—and there was a great deal to be said for it, though he believed it rested more on sentiment than on practical knowledge—to dissociate the pension system from the Poor Law, which was very unpopular in many parts of the country. Yet, as was said by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, it was perfectly true that in the country districts no stigma rested on those who needed Poor Law relief. It was well understood that outdoor relief was the last resource which the public had to adopt in order to prevent people from starving and suffering, and they gave outdoor relief because there was no pension. The relieving officer was not the unpopular person he was thought to be, and he believed that he would be more popular than the revenue officer. Of this he was quite certain, the relieving officer knew the requirements of the poor in the country better than the revenue officer. If he had to recast this clause, he would leave the pension committee in it, and get rid of the pension officer. He believed that the pension committee in the country districts would be able to get the information they wanted in their own way. In the towns it would be totally different. The mistake the Government were making was in their applying the same machinery to both the towns and the country. In the towns no doubt they would want more than one pension officer. In the big towns the congested population included a large number of the poorer classes, and there the revenue officer would have to be doubled and trebled before he would be able to do his work. In the country districts, if they did not like to employ the relieving officer, they could have the pension committee to make choice of the people to furnish them with the necessary information. But the Government said that the pension committee did not find the money out of which the pensions came, and, therefore, they could not let them grant them. Why did they say in the Bill that the pension committee were to arrive at a decision, and then say they could not trust them because the money was not theirs, and they must have somebody above them?

He believed that they could perfectly well leave this matter to the local committee as proposed under the Bill, and get rid altogether of the pension officer, leaving, if necessary, an appeal to the Local Government Board. It was rather an absurd position in which to be placed that they had to raise this question on an Amendment of which they could not approve, moved in a speech of which they strongly disapproved. In order to follow a course which they thought was right they had apparently to support an Amendment which they thought wrong. That was not the fault of the Opposition. They would much rather make their statement and survey on the general discussion of the clause as a whole. They could not pick and choose, and were compelled to raise it in a most unfortunate form. On the decision at which the Committee arrived in reference to this most important question depended the smooth and successful working of the Bill or the reverse. Further, it should be remembered that the money they were spending was Imperial money, and they were touching closely on the limits of local government. However carefully they might frame the provisions for old-age pensions, in the rural districts they would undoubtedly come alongside, and very close up to, the action of the Poor Law guardians in granting relief to the poor. They were going to call up a body of men who were members of various local authorities to form the pension committee, and he submitted that they had no right to put them in that position unless they clothed them with actual power. He believed it would be better to strengthen the position of the pension committee and to get rid of the pension officer. He thought it right to take the present opportunity of telling the Committee what the view of the Opposition was as to this clause. He hoped to see it altered before it left the Committee, and made at once more agreeable to the people concerned and more likely to be successfully administered.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. MASTERMAN, West Ham, N.) said it was of course entirely in agreement with the general wishes of the Committee, and had already been suggested by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the whole question of the machinery should be raised on the first Amendment. No doubt it might have been more convenient to deal with each piece of the machinery separately, but they had no guarantee that each piece as it arose would have been able to be dealt with with liberal discussion, thanks to the fact that they had only a day. As a matter of fact, as everyone would honestly acknowledge, this was not a party controversial point in any sense of the word. It was true there had been a controversy between the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin and the hon. Member for Woodstock, but that was rather a discussion on the amenities and realities of rural life, upon which they held different opinions, than of the machinery of the Bill. He had no wish to enter that discussion, but he supposed most of them would agree in their hearts that if they drew something like a mean between the picture of universal benignity on one side, and what the hon. Member for the Woodstock division called accursed feudalism on the other, they would not be very far from the truth. As to the question of the inquiry and the obligation laid either on the Imperial officer or the relieving officer or upon some local committee, not only to make the preliminary inquiry, which was difficult, but also to continue the inquiries from time to time, to which the right hon. Gentleman stated he had a fundamental objection, they agreed, but, in so much of this debate, they were not dealing with stupidities or lack of foresight in the drafting of Resolutions or Bills, but with fundamental difficulties which had been familiar to all who had gone into the subject, and which accompanied any scheme which was not a universal scheme, as the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had pointed out two days ago. If there had been different drafting in the Bill the same fundamental difficulties would have arisen. It might be objectionable that the Imperial officer should have laid upon him this continued inquiry, but it would be more objectionable if it was given to the relieving officer. If there was one thing upon which that House would absolutely make up its mind in connection with this machinery manipulation, whatever Amendments they were prepared to listen to, they would not be prepared to lay this burden of pension investigation upon the relieving officer, because that, certainly in the towns and, to a large extent, in the villages also, would bring the whole scheme into such intimate connection with the disability of the Poor Law as would make it profoundly unpopular among the very class who they hoped would come in and immediately benefit by it. With regard to the functions of the committee, he had less controversy with the language of the clause, and more difficulty in finding out exactly what the objections were to the clause as it stood, than perhaps some other Members of the House. To him the working of the machinery appeared comparatively simple. The pension committee, under subsection (*a*) of Clause 7 received all claims for pensions and automatically referred them to the Excise man or the Imperial officer. He should think they would be prepared to receive suggestions from anyone as to those who had a right to claim. There were only two possibilities under the Amendment. Either they must leave the pension officer absolute authority to decide in any case of uncertainty as to income, as to association with pauperism, or as to past history in connection with what his right hon. friend called the industry test, with his decision final, or they must make some tribunal to receive an appeal from the pension officer, or they must adopt some such system as this, where under subsection (*b*) the reports of the pension officers were submitted to the local pension committee. The local pension committee, in the case of any doubt, might obtain any further information from the pension officer as to the claim in question, and might certainly consider any difficult cases brought before them, such as those indicated in the general discussion they had been having for the past few days. Further, there were a number of small but difficult points that it would be exceedingly undesirable to throw entirely upon the responsibility of a single man to decide in connection with this most important decision as to whether an old man or woman should receive a pension or not. Supposing the pension officer reported in favour and the pension committee accepted the report, the applicant would get his pension. If the pension officer reported against a pension, and the committee also reported against it, he would not get his pension. But in any case where the pension committee said "Yes," and the pension officer "No," then the mattter was referred to the central pension department. Surely that was the natural meaning. If that was not so, and the point was raised later in the debate, he was sure the Local Government Board and his right hon. friend were fully prepared to establish a satisfactory system. Now he came to the demand of the hon. Member for Woodstock to sweep away the pension committee. He was not quite sure whether the hon. Member was as anxious that the committee should be swept away as he was to emit some explosive sentiments. To begin with, he made no distinction between town and country, and swept away the local committee because, he said, in rural life county councils and their nominees were against the democratic spirit and would be inclined to be prejudiced against ardent democratic work. If he desired that, he ought to have drawn the distinction very sharp, because that was certainly not the case in towns where the great majority of the population were, and the only method by which labour representation could be introduced into the scheme was by some such committee as this, the town councils appointing members of their own bodies and outsiders to form a first court of appeal. Without some such committee as that, the whole decision as to whether a man should have a pension or not depended entirely upon the nominee of the Department whose interest must be, from its nature, not to give a pension rather than otherwise. If the Treasury was not the guardian of the public purse it would be unfaithful to its duties, and in consequence it would be for the Imperial officer, representing the Treasury, to be more inclined to use evidence which tended to prove that the man came under one of the disabilities, than for the local committee, where, as was declared in the characteristic and welcome speech from the noble Lord the Member for Lincolnshire, the whole impulse both in towns and country would be to get as many pensioners as possible. Allusion had been made to West Ham. Speaking with a due sense of responsibility for that respectable neighbourhood, he assured the Committee that its whole inclination where Imperial money was concerned was to get as much of it as possible—not only because it was good for the people themselves, but because it was good for trade generally, most of the money being spent in the neighbourhood; and therefore, so far from the fear of his hon. friend being fulfilled that the pension committee would act as a check upon the liberality of the Treasury and the Imperial officer, he was almost entirely convinced that the impulse towards enlargement would come from the pension committee, and the impulse towards the reduction of expenditure from the Treasury. Then, it was very evident that Parliament would under no circumstances give absolute discretion to an Imperial officer as to whether a pension should be given or not in doubtful cases. They must, therefore, have a Court of Appeal. He would submit to anyone familiar with the realities of rural life that the knowledge that an appeal had to go to the justices of the peace would, of itself, cause a very large amount of repugnance to carry out any appeal at all; whereas the pension committee would be regarded as a perfectly natural and satisfactory method of machinery in so far as it was kept apart from and recognised as independent of the machinery of the Poor Law. If they were not to have a local committee of some such character as this, the only other suggestion was that every appeal should go to the central authority, and that as a matter of machinery would break down. It would mean an enormous increase in staff, because they might have to deal with thousands of appeals. It seemed to them that this first sifting, under which no substantial injustice could be done, was a quite satisfactory method by which all the obvious cases of doubt could be first of all dealt with locally, and the right to challenge in the event of diverse decisions in cases of more intricacy and difficulty should be carried to the Local Government Board. For these reasons the Government asked the House to support the formation of the local pension committees.

MR. WALTER LONG asked what provision was made in the Bill for the publication of the report of the pension officer. Was it proposed that it should take some public form?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he would answer the various points raised later on.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) said the effect of the machinery made the appointment of the local pension committee entirely useless. The committee had to refer claims to the pension officer, who would submit his report to the pension committee. The pension committee could return the report to the pension officer. If the decision of the local pension committee allowed a claim for a pension not in accordance with the report of the pension officer, then the matter could be referred to the central pension committee. If the supplementary information upon which the local pension committee wished to act differed from the report of the pension officer, the report stood and the matter had to go to the Local Government Board Surely that was not common sense, but it was the only option left to the local committee. Obviously, what would be sensible and just was that the committee with the pension officer should consider the supplementary information, vary the report, and come to an agreement. He did not think that that was the effect of the clause as it stood. He would like to know if the Attorney-General was satisfied with the language of subsection (*c*). What would happen in the case of disallowing the claim? He would like the Government to consider these two questions. He held strongly that they ought not to put this limitation upon a body of local gentlemen who would be desirous of doing justice, because it was most undesirable that they as well as the pension officer should be fettered by these very restrictive words; they should be left to arrive at a determination of a case together.

*MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars) said the Government had discovered that there were fundamental difficulties in connection with the Bill. He and some of his colleagues had foreseen them before they had had much experience of the discussion; all these difficulties were inseparable from any Bill of a partial character. He was going to vote against the Amendment, feeling perfectly sure that what the hon. Member had proposed would not work out satisfactorily. There were objections to the Bill as it was framed, so far as these committees were concerned. He looked with considerable apprehension to the formation of co-opted committees which might include all sorts of faddists and people who arrogated to themselves the possession of virtues which sometimes they did not possess. The Charity Organisation Society was no doubt a very useful body in its way; but he felt that the Charity Organisation agents would be on the spot when these committees were formed and would no doubt be appointed on those committees, and inasmuch as that Society took a view in regard to the provision of pensions by the State altogether contrary to the principle of the Bill, it seemed to him that they would not get efficient service from them. He would be just as keen to exclude local authorities dealing with the Poor Law as the Charity Organisation authority, since the Bill was intended to dissociate pensions from the Poor Law, and he was not going to agree to the Poor Law officer coming in at the back door after being thrust out from the front. He was likewise opposed to a friendly society man or a trade unionist official on these committees, since they would be liable to judge partially in regard to cases brought before the committees. He was in favour of the committees because he wanted this pension scheme to be associated with the local life of the people where pensions were to be distributed, and he wanted to see a committee of really representative men who had gone through the mill and been elected to public positions. That would be a very considerable safeguard for the exclusion of faddists and the other persons he had mentioned. If women could be added to these bodies so much the better. He would heartily welcome any proposal for the inclusion of women in those bodies. It had been said by the hon. Member for South Dublin that those committees would not really have much power, and that the central official and the Excise officer who made the report would really be the man to determine whether or not a pension was to be paid. He did not agree with that. So long as they kept the committees apart from the Excise officer, and they were in a position to discuss amongst themselves with absolute independence, there was considerable scope for the committee. He had had experience in connection with trade unionists, and they frequently found it necessary to have recourse to local officers upon cases sent up for adjudication. He hoped the Excise officer would not be brought in to act with the committee, because in that event he would be sure to become the guiding factor, and he wanted the committee to consider the report in a perfectly independent manner. He noticed that no provision was made for an appeal by the claimant to a pension which was refused by a local committee. The right hon. Gentleman had referred them to an Amendment on the point which was on the Paper, but in view of the closure it was useless to refer them to Amendments later on. He was not speaking against the closure because he felt that it was a regrettable necessity. He referred more to the long-winded speeches from the front Opposition Benches. If they reached the Amendment referred to there would certainly have to be less speeches from the front benches, and they would have to be much shorter.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) thought the committee ought to be got rid of at any cost. He admitted that Committees that had examined this question had regarded a local committee as of primary importance, but this was under different conditions. The Report of the Select Committee of 1899, which was presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wimbledon, contained this sentence—

> "It seems to us to be essential that the authority to grant the pension should also be the authority which finds the means."

The committee to be constituted under this Bill, however, did not find the means, but on the contrary they would relieve local charges by using the Bill, and consequently they would have an inducement to grant pensions widely, because by so doing they would relieve the local rates. Every Committee which had proposed that there should be a local committee had done so on the ground that, having the charge of moneys raised by the local rates, they ought to have the right of granting the pension and judging of the claim which an applicant had to it. His view twenty years ago was that there should be a committee, and that it should be appointed by the county council. In the Bill which he took about the country some fifteen years ago and discussed in various parts of rural England, he proposed that a committee should be appointed by the county council. A local rate was to be levied for pensions, and, therefore, it was only fair that a local committee should be appointed to spend their own money. In every locality he was met with hostile criticism in regard to the proposal to appoint a committee. If there was one form of mind more suspicious than another, it was that of the agricultural labourer. That suspicion was deep-seated and strong; they feared not only the favouritism and partiality of a local committee, but they resented any inquisition on the part of neighbours or local residents into their affairs. If a committee was to have any power whatever in this matter, and to command confidence, it must be one consisting of active people acquainted with the poor who would make inquiries in every case where a pension was suggested. But the committee now proposed was worse than ordinary committees, because it was not of a representative character. It might consist of men who had gone through the ordeal of election to public bodies, or it might consist of nominated members. There might be sub-committees nominated to do the work, and consequently any inquiry or investigation would be of the most odious nature to the rural mind. He believed that a committee of that kind would be a serious blot on the administration of the Bill. It would engender an amount of suspicion in the rural districts which would be fatal to the efficiency of the work, or to that satisfactory working which would give confidence to the people to whom the awards were made. He had been driven from the position of approving of a local committee to that of desiring to substitute something else. He did not think the appointment of a pension officer was the best solution, though it was one which he would prefer to a committee. There were various other means. He would like to see the Treasury in this matter doing away with all appeals to the Local Government Board. He did not think the Local Government Board, which was already the most over-burdened Department of the State, had time to do this work. If the Department had to go into appeals in hundreds and thousands of cases in regard to pensions the work would be left to a permanent official, who would look over these things from the high and dry position of the exact wording of the law, and consequently the decisions would not command that regard and consideration which they would if they were dealt with in other ways. That it should be left to a Department which was not properly in charge of the scheme, and that the Treasury should allow the Local Government Board to incur expenditure in these cases, was a blot on the system. He thought they might get rid of the pension committee altogether if they had another kind of authority. All the preliminary inquiries must be made by the pension officer. He would find out all about the individual. The Bill had been improved in the course of its passage through Committee. Now, nearly all these inquiries were to be of a documentary kind. The Bill had been made more automatic. It ought to be absolutely automatic. There ought to be no personal inquisition into the life of any applicant. He wished to see the Bill improved in that direction. It could be made so that nothing but documentary evidence need be required. About the applicants' means, the evidence would be given on oath so that the applicant made himself liable to severe penalties if he made a false statement. That would all be done if they substituted what was found necessary in New Zealand. There they had adopted the principle of having these pension cases all decided in Court by a stipendiary magistrate, who, with all the documents before him, allowed the claimant to come in and make a statement to the contrary if he desired to do so. The inquiry was made by a local officer, called the registrar, who reported to the magistrate, and the Court gave a decision. The decision need not be in public, so that there would be no unnecessary exposure of a man's life or means. That would do away with the necessity for any appeal to the Local Government Board. He would much rather that the work was done by the mayor of a borough or the chairman of a county council than by a committee. If it was to be done by an Imperial officer, it might be done by a stipendiary magistrate or a County Court Judge. If none of these officers were available they might follow the example in connection with the preparation of the electoral rolls. That was difficult and delicate work, and yet they could entrust it to the revising barrister. Such an officer would not cost very much, he could sit so many times a year to hear claims, and the judgment he gave would settle the cases. On the other hand, if local committees were chosen they would find various reasons for rejecting applications for pensions. A committee might consist of local busybodies who prided themselves in taking a stringent attitude, or it might consist of men who would not regard with favour applicants in a rural district who had ever killed a rabbit or a hare. Such people would have a very poor chance of getting their pensions. [Cries of "Oh."] He was not saying that from any political bias. It would be equally the same with Members on that side of the House. Wherever they had local committees they were bound to have a certain amount of political feeling introduced into work of this kind. There was a great deal of human nature in both the Tory Party and the Liberal Party. He had found that it was very prevalent in local committees. It was almost inevitable that partiality of feeling should enter into the minds of the local committees, and that, taken in conjunction with the suspicion which characterised the rural mind, would, he was sure, lead to great dissatisfaction in connection with the work of such committees.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said the question they were now considering was whether or not the proposed local pension committee was of any practical use. It seemed to him that all the speeches he had listened to were to the effect that the committee would be of no practical use whatever. It had been pointed out with practical unanimity by hon. Members holding widely different views on the general subject of old-age pensions that the function of the local committee, if the clause stood as it was in the Bill, would be merely to register the decisions of the pension officer. He understood that they were able on this Amendment to consider the larger and more important question whether the whole machinery of the clause was of any use. He was bound to say that his concern on that subject had been greatly strengthened by what had been said on the present Amendment. The machinery clause was of the greatest practical importance in regard to the scheme, and it should be perfectly explicit. It was, however, absolutely vague on all the matters of detail which were of real importance in the working of the scheme. There were two forms of questions which were dealt with in this section. There were questions raised by the original claim and questions raised after the pension was granted. Nothing was said as to how the original claim was to be made; but, having been made, it was to be laid before the local pension committee, and that body was to pass it on to the pension officer to make inquiry and report. The pension officer was recommended as being, at any rate, an Imperial officer. No doubt there were many devoted and laborious servants of the Crown, but it seemed to him that none of them would be able to compare in point of dignity or favour with this lonely unbefriended man defending the taxpayer and the Exchequer against extortion by repeated and continuous inquiries of the most sordid and disagreeable description—inquiries which it would be the direct interest of every human being to render nugatory. He did not know whether hon. Gentlemen realised the extraordinary duties and functions which this officer would have to perform under this clause. He would have, in every case, to have produced to him the applicant's birth certificate, and, if married, his marriage certificate; to take a complete account of the man's means and of the means of his wife, of how long his residence had been within the United Kingdom, and to make sure in every case that the man had not for ten years been in gaol. He would have to discover whether or not the applicant had habitually failed or not failed to work according to ability, opportunity, and need—which would vary in every case—and which need and opportunity throughout the whole of the man's life the pension officer would have to determine for himself. He must make an absolute exposure of the whole financial position of the man, not only actually but potentially, and of his discretion to manage his own affairs. He had to discover whether or not he had joined within the last few weeks a friendly society or benefit club, or had received a Christmas-box or charitable donation of any kind. He would have to sound the wall of the man's cottage to be sure that he had no hidden hoard, and to search for papers in order to be certain that he had not conveyed some portion of his property to some of his relations to their mutual benefit. He knew that the Chancellor of the Exchequer ridiculed a description of that sort. An hon. Gentleman opposite on the previous night had ridiculed the notion that the pension officer would search to see whether a man had a hoard or make sure whether a man actually owned his own house. But he was not overdrawing the picture of what was really possible. He was simply stating what were the actual duties laid by the Government on this pension officer who was bound to carry them out. It was perfectly absurd for the Government to come down and lay these enormous and vital duties on their servants in the interest of the taxpayer and the Exchequer and expect that they would be seriously carried out. From his point of view, he was sure that this wretched Imperial officer would do his best. He would make, and have to make, a most invidious and painful inquiry, and it seemed to him that an officer to whom those powers and duties were to be entrusted might equally well be entrusted with the decision of the claim to a pension. But when the pension officer had made this laborious inquiry, as the clause was drawn, he might be overruled, and without any appeal, by the pension committee. According to his reading of subsection (*c*) it would be perfectly within the power of the pension committee to disallow a claim, and although they disagreed with the report of the pension committee the pension officer was not to make any appeal to the Local Government Board, or to make any appeal whatever. The subsection said—

> "If any decision of the local pension committee allowing a claim for a pension or determining any question is not in accordance with the report of the pension officer, the matter should be referred to the central pension authority, and should be considered and determined by them."

There was nothing there about the decision of the pension committee being disallowed. There was one other consideration. The clause contemplated not merely the case of the original claimant, but the case of a pension having been granted, and the man for one reason or another being disqualified from continuing to receive the pension. But if the information as to disqualification could not easily be got at what was to prevent the man from receiving the pension for life? A man might have made a false statement; he might have come into a fortune after receiving the pension; or many other events might happen which would disqualify him from continuing to receive the pension. What was extremely important was that the Government should provide that it should be somebody's interest or duty to see that the pension did not go on being paid for an indefinite time. There was no machinery by which it could be discovered whether the man continued to have a right to draw his pension. Under the clause it would be nobody's business to ferret into the case. Why should one object to an old man of seventy-two or seventy-five years of age getting this little money? The right would be taken on trust. Nobody would put himself in the odious position of objecting to the old man getting the pension of 5s. a week. The subsection suggested that that extremely disagreeable duty should be carried out by the pension officer. Was the pension officer to occupy what little spare time he had in running over the whole district to see whether any pensioner had become disqualified or had done something which might disqualify him from continuing to receive his pension? Was he to understand that the case would have to be referred to the central committee; and would they refer it back to the pension committee, who in turn would refer it to the pension officer to inquire into his own report? The whole scheme was full of objections; and he did not believe that any pension officer or any human being could be found who could satisfactorily make these enormous, prolonged, and complicated inquiries. In regard to the Amendment, for his part he regarded the pension committee as, on the whole, likely in the practical working out of the scheme, to be a useful body, but he would hesitate to throw the complete obligation on to the pension officer. If the hon. Member merely moved the leaving out all the words after "determined" he would feel no hesitation in supporting him, but as to what other words should be inserted he was not now prepared to say.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham) said that there were difficulties almost inseparable from any scheme of old-age pensions which the Government desired to meet as far as possible. He did not think that hon. Gentlemen opposite would support a universal scheme of old-age pensions; therefore if they were in favour of any other schemes they should be prepared to consider possible methods of overcoming the difficulties connected with the present proposal. He wished to express shortly the pleasure he felt that the Government were resisting the proposal made by the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment. He thought it was necessary in the disposal of these pensions that there should be some form of local committee, composed of gentlemen connected with the district, who had known for years past those who would become applicants for and who would enjoy the benefits of a pension. He ventured to say that the appointment of a committee of members of the county council was not the wisest form of constituting the body. For himself, he would advocate that work of this character should be placed under the guidance of the district council. They were a more local body, and more in touch with the working people of the district. There would not be applicants coming forward every day. They would come by ones and twos in the country districts, and the gentlemen and ladies who formed this committee would be in touch with the applicants and would be much more likely to know their circumstances, being part of the district council, than a committee appointed by the county council which had to deal with the whole of a large county. It would be impossible for the members of such a committee to be in close touch with all the centres and districts of the county. He disagreed with the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman opposite made when he spoke in a previous part of the debate, that the relieving officer would be a more appropriate officer than the Excise officer. The relieving officer was appointed by the local authority, and was in no way responsible to the State. The Excise officer would be directly representative of the State and of the taxes, and therefore seemed the only appropriate officer in existence to whom the work should be given of guiding and directing the local committee. But he thought it became more important, if this Excise officer was to give a really valuable report to the local committee, that the material at his disposal should be in its truest sense of a definite character. Unfortunately, owing to the exigencies of debate, they had been unable to discuss Clause 3, which, in his opinion, was the most important clause of the Bill, especially that subsection of it which dealt with the question of employment. As it at present stood, subsection (3) of Clause 3, in its amended form, was of a very vague character—

> "Who work to the best of their ability and opportunity for those legally dependent upon them."

That at best was a very vague definition, and it would, of course, be very difficult for the most competent Excise officer to come to a really definite and clear decision upon it. He would like to see inserted in the Bill an elaboration of that provision, and with that object in view he had himself put down a new clause, providing that, if the Excise officer was to have definite information, it must appear in a written statement of claim prepared by the applicant for the pension. He hoped that this was contemplated by his right hon. friend. He thought it would be much better to have the matter definitely laid down in the schedules of the Bill, so that the statement of claim might show clearly the age and occupation of the applicant, where he had lived, what had been his employment during the previous ten years, and who his employers had been. He would like to see the statement of claim accompanied by two certificates endorsed by responsible people in the locality, thus showing definitely to the Excise officer that what was stated was accurate and could be relied upon. He thought in that way the Excise officer would have more real material to work upon in coming to a decision, and would be able to report to the local pension committee his opinion upon the facts laid before him. There would then be much more likelihood of a definite and clear opinion being come to by the local pension authority. It would be of advantage to both sides. In the first place, a statement of the character he suggested, put down plainly, and with endorsements, would be of advantage in making it quite clear that the conditions defined in the Bill——

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member really cannot go into this new clause to such a large extent.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER said he would abide by the Chairman's ruling and would not go further into the point. He had only mentioned the idea because he thought the present material on which the Excise officer had to work, to form an opinion, and report to the pension committee, was somewhat vaguely introduced in the Bill, and he would like to have seen the provision framed in a more definite form. He believed the real efficacy of the Excise officer's report would depend upon the definite information which he would be able to obtain, and he hoped something of the character he had suggested would be inserted in the Bill.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said that whether or not the Amendment was accepted, whether or not the decision arrived at was subject to appeal to the Local Government Board, or whether or not the pension committee was retained, it was quite clear that the position of the pension officer was going to be one of great responsibility and importance for the purposes of the Bill. If the committee were retained, it would be only through the eyes of the pension officer that they would see. They would act on information supplied by him of his own motion, or in answer to the pension committee's inquiries, and, as he understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the pension committees must, like a jury, act on the facts as presented to them by the pension officer. Under these circumstances it became of great importance to know who the pension officer was to be. It had been generally assumed throughout these discussions that the pension officer would be an Excise officer; but the words "Excise officer" were nowhere used in the Bill; they had only heard of the Excise officer in the speeches of the Prime Minister, and the subsequent speeches of Ministers had been carefully consistent on that subject. What was stated in the Bill was that—

> "A pension officer shall be appointed by the Treasury,"

and the Treasury might appoint pension officers in such numbers and in such districts as they thought fit. He could conceive that it was the intention of the Government to allow the appointment of none but Excise officers, but he thought they ought to have a definite statement from them on the subject. If that was their intention, then he asked them whether they thought it possible that the Excise officers, in many cases, would be able to do this new work over the whole of their districts, without assistance. If the Government thought the Excise officers would require assistance, how did they propose to give it to them? There was no provision in the Bill for giving them clerks or assistants, but there was power in the Treasury, if they chose, to appoint two men in a district which for Excise purposes was now in the hands of one officer. Another matter of great importance was this. The pension officer would occupy a position of great influence, and his would be a very invidious position. He would be more influential than any other man in the country in exercising the most vast system of patronage which the State had. It was very important that the officer charged with this important duty, however humble his rank and position, should be above suspicion. His appointment should have no partisan origin—nothing about it which had its source in party spirit. The Excise officer had to compete in the Civil Service examinations before he could get his position, and it could not be alleged that he had been put there for a party purpose any more than it could be said of any other Civil servant. But this Bill did not confine the appointment to Excise officers, and the Treasury might appoint whom they thought fit. They could make a series of appointments, not on the recommendation of a permanent official, but on the old patronage system. There might be a party recommendation to the Patronage Secretary to the Treasury, and such recommendations might be made even by Members of that House. Clearly that was not a tolerable situation. It was not a thing which any of them on either side of the House would desire. He asked the Government, when they replied on the Amendment, to state what their intentions were, and at the same time to give an assurance that they would so amend this clause or the next clause as definitely to secure that every man holding one of these appointments, whether he were an Excise officer or not, had entered the Civil Service by competitive examination and not by patronage.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said the right hon. Gentleman had opened his remarks by saying that the duties of the pension officer would be immensely important because the pension committee would have to act entirely upon his report. That might be true if they had constituted a committee who knew nothing about the local circumstances. But the really important point was that there would be a committee who would know the local details and undoubtedly be in touch with the people. Unless they had a committee who knew all the circumstances, they would have, as had been pointed out by several Members, inquisitorial examinations into the lives of the applicants. When the tribunal consisted of neighbours, and so on, there would be no inquisitorial proceedings, because the committee would know all about the persons in their district. He knew of a gentleman who, when summoned before a County Court Judge for the payment of a debt, pleaded no means. Although the Judge himself knew that that gentleman was in possession of something like £600 a year derived from relatives, there was no documentary evidence of means, and he had to treat the case as if the man had nothing. But the committee would not be compelled to deal in that way. They would know what the man had generally, although there was no documentary evidence to prove it. The Committee would like to know, therefore, what these committees were going to be. It would affect their voting. He thought a local committee would be a great safeguard to the Exchequer, and also a great advantage to the men applying for a pension.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said the Secretary to the Local Government Board in the early part of the debate had alluded to the difficulties which crowded on them on this subject as fundamental difficulties that must be encountered. They were fundamental difficulties undoubtedly, but were such as would arise in any Bill of a non-contributory character. Speaking as a Member for a rural constituency, and speaking of what he knew of the rural districts, he believed that the words of the Government would work better than the Amendment, for which he could not possibly vote. The hon. Member for the Blackfriars Division of Glasgow had objected to extending this clause outside the councils because it would make room for faddists on the committees, but faddists would find their way on to any committee. His right hon. friend the Member for the Ilkeston Division had spoken of the suspicion in the rural mind. That was a thing that would never be got rid of, but his opinion was that the people likely to be affected by this Bill were less likely to be suspicious of a local committee than of an extraneous one. There were people in the rural districts who would be suspicious of any committee. He thought the Government plan was best, but he hoped they would give power of appeal to the persons whose applications were rejected. If there was no power of appeal, there would be a sense of soreness which would go far to undo a great deal of the good of the Bill. He agreed that the Government had not inserted the words Excise officer in the Bill as the person who was to do this work, but by common consent he was considered to be, and he did not think the relieving officer was at all the proper person to take charge of the work. His own opinion was that the Government would be forced to create a new class of men for that purpose, and for nothing else. The Government would no doubt see the wisdom of appointing an officer entirely removed from political bias. It would be impossible for the Excise or any other officer who had other duties to perform to perform these as well.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the discussion was wide enough without its being widened by drawing morals as to the advantage of a universal or a contributory scheme. There were certain considerations which seemed to affect the rural districts, but in a sense contrary to what had been stated that day. The hon. Member for Lichfield seemed to think that a local committee would be likely to know the people, but in the rural districts that would not be so, because it would be the county councils. The Bill gave power to appoint sub-committees, but unless the whole authority was delegated to them would they do the work? Unless the whole power was delegated to these sub-committees it would be done by the county councils, who had no local knowledge but paper knowledge, and directly they were driven to paper knowledge it was a matter of indifference where the committee was. Everything must rest with the pension officer. In these cases every district was going to refuse the information required for disqualification and patch up the case so as to present the best case for every applicant. They were not going to incur the unpopularity of keeping people off the pension list. They would report in favour of everybody, and the pension officer would have to bear the whole of the odium. He quite agreed with what had been said as to the appointment of the Excise officer. It was assumed that the Excise officer did not go about his district and would have no knowledge, but he was very much about his district at the present time. He went after the dogs, and inasmuch as he sometimes succeeded in causing the collection of two licences for the same dog, in the opinion of some he was about the district too much. He was not very popular in his district for that reason. But he was now going to cease dealing with dogs and deal with people, and he would have to bear the odium of these odious inquiries. He would therefore naturally try to protect himself as far as possible by the form of certificate he would obtain. The Bill certainly contemplated a written declaration, as would be seen not only from the subsection under discussion but from the whole of Clause 9. It would, of course, depend on the regulations, and they did not know what would be put into those regulations, but certainly the pension officer would go as far as the regulations allowed him in obtaining a written certificate. It was certain that the deficiencies in the claim would be patched up, and that the local committees would strain every point in favour of the applicant. They would say: "It is quite true that nine or ten years ago this man did so and so, but he ought to have a pension." So that in every case the pension officer, and the pension officer alone, would have to do the work. He should support the Government, because he did not see what other scheme they could adopt. It seemed to him the best choice that could be made. The difficulty was enormous, but it was inherent in any scheme that picked and chose in this way, and therefore, while they ought not to attach too much importance to local committees in rural districts, yet on the whole they could not do better under the circumstances than what the Government proposed.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) asked whether it was wise from the point of view of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to entrust the administration of these large sums of money to local bodies elected by the ratepayers, whose local interest was to protect the rates. Was it not placing these gentlemen in a very invidious position? Their natural inclination as representing the ratepayers would be to put as many pensioners on the Exchequer fund as they could, because the more they did that the more they would relieve the rates. This was Imperial money and ought to be administered by officials appointed by the Government. He rather agreed with the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ilkeston when he said in lieu of the local body he would place the decision in the hands of either a stipendiary or a County Court Judge. There was a precedent for the County Court Judge in the Workmen's Compensation Act. He agreed most thoroughly with the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire that the pension officer ought to be a man of a very high character who would act independently of party in any way. He suggested the class of men from whom surveyors of income-tax were drawn. He had come across them as a Commissioner of Income-Tax, and they were men quite above suspicion. Did the local authorities want this further duty placed upon them? He understood that some of them at all events did not. The London County Council were making representations at the present moment that they did not want this duty cast upon them.

MR. MASTERMAN: They only suggest that the borough councils would be more appropriate.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS said the hon. Gentleman did not know whether the borough councils wanted it either. In his opinion, and he had had some experience, these bodies had quite enough to do already—more than they could do properly. The last Education Act cast upon them duties which entailed an immense amount of time, and the duties had become so onerous in many localities that they had difficulty in finding to undertake men them. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would take into consideration the arguments he had placed before him, and also what was said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ilkeston, that a committee appointed by a local authority was not altogether a satisfactory body to administer Imperial money.

*MR. GEORGE D. FABER (York) said it seemed to him that so much depended on elaborating the proper machinery to decide who should or should not be entitled to a pension that the discussion was one of the most important that had arisen. The Government had had a very difficult choice before them, because whichever way one looked difficulties met them, but on the whole he thought the machinery the Government had devised was not unsatisfactory in all the circumstances of the case. Let them imagine, however, that the scheme had been established, and an old man of seventy wanted a pension. How would he claim it—orally, or in writing? If he made it in writing, would he lodge it with the local pension committee? Would it have to be in a stereotyped form? The pension committee could look at the claim, as he understood it, but when it was lodged they had nothing to do for the moment. They handed it over to the pension officer, who had to go into all the facts of the case on his own mere notion. Nobody could interfere with him. Would the evidence he took be upon oath? Before an applicant could qualify for a pension this officer had to go into the most inquisitorial examination. They had been told in the earlier discussions that there would be nothing inquisitorial, but there must be a great deal that was inquisitorial or the pension officer would not be performing the statutory obligations which were laid upon him. Where would the inquiry be held—in open Court or in the cottage of the applicant? Would it be with closed doors? Would the local community be allowed to be present? All these were matters which would arise in almost every case. When the inquiry was concluded the officer who had conducted it could do no more, but he handed over the determination to a different body altogether. He doubted whether this part of the machinery was the best that could be devised. They were essentially, cardinally, at the very root, dividing the responsibility. The officer's report went to the committee, who could not go into any evidence at all. The hon. Member for Lichfield had spoken about the pension committee using their local knowledge, but he doubted if they could use it. He doubted if they could look outside the four corners of the report, or ask for any further information that could be given them except what was given by the pension officer. He asked anyone who had listened to him whether that was a satisfactory solution of the difficulty, which he agreed was inherent in the case, whichever way they put it. But his cardinal objection was that they severed the responsibility, that one man took the evidence and another body gave the judgment, and the second body could not go into any evidence at all. They were making the local pension committee practically a court of appeal that could only consider the evidence that was submitted to them by the local officer. He would have thought it much better to have given, in the first instance, fuller power to the pension officer; to let him hear the evidence and come to a conclusion upon it. He was in a much better position to adjudicate upon the matter. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to lend a sympathetic ear to *bona fide* objections, and even at that hour so to alter the scheme that the local officer should be the judge in the first instance, and then give fuller power to the pension committee on appeal.

*SIR MAURICE LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) said the hon. Member had conjured up all sorts of objections that existed nowhere except in his own imagination. The hon. Member appeared to desire one man only to be the deciding factor as to whether a person ought to have a pension or not. They on that side of the House were anxious that as many as possible should be eligible for and receive pensions, and believed the proposals of the Government to establish pension committees far preferable to the suggestion of the hon. Member for York, who appeared to disapprove of inquiry and yet wanted more. Would hon. Gentlemen opposite support an Amendment to the effect that every person over seventy should be able to walk into the post office and demand their pension? If so he would put an Amendment on the paper to effect that. [Cries of "Move it."] He wished to impress upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the pension committee ought not to be elected by the district councils, for after all they were simply Poor Law guardians. They ought, as far as possible, to keep the scheme clear of any idea that it was Poor Law relief. He would rather have a committee than leave the matter in the hands of one individual. It was far better to adopt the Government plan, but he would like it to be made clear and definite that the pension committee should be composed of a majority of elected members to the borough and county councils. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not be in a hurry to decide who should be the pension officer. It had been suggested he should be the Excise officer. Many county councils had already expressed the opinion that they did not feel themselves in a position to take over the duties now performed by the Excise officer and which were to be transferred to them in order to give the Excise officers time to act as pension officers. The hon. Member did not trust the Treasury; he appeared to think the appointment of pension officers was too much patronage to be in the hands of the Government and would lead to the appointment of unsuitable men. He did not believe there was justification for any such fears; in the past the appointment of our Civil servants whether by Liberal or Conservative Governments had been satisfactory, and we had a body of Civil servants we were justly proud of; he therefore had no fear the Treasury would appoint unsuitable men.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he agreed with what had been said by most of those who had taken part in the debate, that next to the fundamental principles of the Bill its most important aspect was its machinery; and he confessed that the discussion of the Amendment left him in the most depressed state of mind as to the mechanism by which the Government desired to carry out their pension scheme. The Bill professed to give the right to a pension to persons with certain qualifications of age and character. The Labour Members thought it was an inherent right. He did not agree with them; but he thought effective machinery should be provided by which, on the one hand, every man who had the statutory right to the pension should be enabled to get it; and by which, on the other, the taxpayers should be protected against persons obtaining the pension who had no right to it. That was the problem they had to solve. What was the plan of the Government? In the first place, they selected an officer who discharged functions partly inquisitorial and partly judicial, the Excise officer, and made him the Court in the first instance. The Excise officer was not a highly-paid official, and, presumably, he was not a highly-educated official. The duties he had now to carry out required energy and impartiality, concerning, as they did, questions whether dog licences had been paid and gun licences taken out, but they did not carry with them, by implication, any proof that he possessed the qualifications which were necessary for the delicate investigations thrown upon him by the pension scheme. In the first place, the Excise officer had to determine the age of the applicant for a pension. That might be a tolerably easy matter in England, but it would be a difficult task in Ireland, where he understood there was no obligatory registration of births until 1860, and the only evidence as to age before that date was the ecclesiastical registers of baptisms. He did not say that the desire to get the pension at the earliest possible age would be peculiar to the Irish. No doubt it would not be confined to any particular part of the United Kingdom. But, after all, the discovery of the age of the applicant would be an easy task compared with the investigation of his previous life's history to discover his character. This task involved powers of a detective and a Judge rolled into one, and it was proposed to place it upon a man whose previous experience was confined to licences for dogs and guns. So much for the qualifications of the man who was to carry out the investigations in the first instance. Then the county council was to be asked to appoint a committee. This committee was not to be given powers of independent investigation to arrive at the truth. They were to be invited to listen to the report of the Excise officer; and if they did not like his first report, to ask him for a second or supplementary report. They were to form an opinion on the evidence brought forward, in the first instance, by one witness alone; and corrected, in the second instance, by the same witness. If they had some doubt as to the justice of the opinion arrived at by the Excise officer, they could call upon him for further information; and if the Excise officer chose to say he had nothing to add to, or nothing to qualify in, his first report, there was nothing further for them to do. This committee of a great county or borough was left face to face with this "Imperial officer," but were absolutely unable to question him. The whole clause was framed on the idea that the committee were to act on the report of the Excise officer and on any further information that he chose to supply. They could not go outside the report. That was the clause as it was drawn. Would county councils appoint committees to occupy this subordinate and humiliating position in the face of the Excise officer? If they did appoint committees, and the committees could be got to sit, would they be able to supervise effectually? Assuming that the Excise officer committed accidentally an act of gross injustice, how were the committee to deal with it? They could not call the applicant before them. Amazing as it seemed, the Government did not appear to have contemplated that the very man who made this appeal should have an opportunity of appearing anywhere at any time or before anybody at all to see that his rights under the Bill were not improperly denied him. He thought that perfectly astounding. When the question came up to the Local Government Board, what were they to do? They also could only have the report of the Exciseman. They never got in this Bill beyond the Exciseman. It was the Exciseman at the beginning, the Exciseman in the middle, and the Exciseman at the end.

MR. MASTERMAN said the Local Government Board had full machinery for dealing with things similar to that in full operation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked what was the machinery provided at the Local Government Board for looking into the character, and age, and property of these applicants for pensions? The only machinery he knew of was the Poor Law machinery, and that machinery he thought the Government had intended to keep out of the old-age pension scheme. The man whose right was in question here was never allowed to appear to give evidence before anybody except the Exciseman. That was preposterous and intolerable machinery. There ought, somehow or somewhere, to be brought in an authority for allowing evidence to be taken, as it were, in open Court, where a poor man could show why he should have his pension. They ought not to throw the whole power over these £7,500,000 entirely into the hands of these very subordinate Civil servants, who were made practically the distributors of this gigantic national subvention according to their own views of justice and equity. The machinery for seeing that justice was done, he was confident, could be greatly improved if only the Committee and the Government themselves had the time and the opportunity to improve it.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that until the right hon. Gentleman got up they were having a quiet and serviceable discussion on the machinery of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had again made a violent attack on the measure. He had shown a great dislike to the Exciseman. That, he thought, must be of Scottish extraction. He had told the Committee that the Exciseman was not a highly-paid and not a highly-educated officer. He did not think a University don would be the best person to discharge these duties. Why were the Excise officers to be considered incompetent? They had to discover the age of a man. Need a man be highly educated, or have great skill, to discover that. They had to make inquiries as to means; and they had to make inquiries as to past character—inquiries made in New Zealand by officials of a very subordinate character. Surely an Excise officer could discover these things or whether a man belonged to a friendly society or trade union. It did not require great scholarship to discover those things. The right hon. Gentleman gave an amusing account of procedure. He had invented his own procedure, and it was naturally a very absurd one. It had nothing to do with the procedure of the Bill. The Government were following the precedent of New Zealand here. They were laying down general principles in outline and leaving the machinery to be developed by regulations. He denied that the Exciseman was at the beginning, the middle, and the end of the Bill. He simply made the preliminary inquiry. The right hon. Gentleman said they could not call the pensioner before them. Of course they could.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) asked where this was set forth.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it would be part of the regulations. If the noble Lord would take the trouble to look at the New Zealand regulations——

LORD R. CECIL said he did not care about New Zealand.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: But the pensioner would care. All this detail with regard to communications with the pension officer and subsequent appeal to the Local Government Board would be provided for in elaborate regulations to be prepared. Embodied in the regulations would be advice to the local pension committee as to the methods of obtaining information not merely from the pension officer, who, however, would be the man primarily responsible, but from other sources.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he might be mistaken in the meaning of subsection (*b*), but it ran—

> "The pension officer shall inquire and report upon any claim or question so referred to him, and the local pension committee shall, on the receipt of the report of the pension officer, and after obtaining from him if necessary any further information as to the claim or question, consider the case and give their decision upon the claim in question."

No regulations could be made repugnant to that.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he quite understood the right hon. Gentleman's point. The subsection said that the local pension committee should employ the pension officer to get information, but that did not prevent them getting information from any other source. If they were going to lay down a whole code of procedure in an Act of Parliament of this sort, it would take up thirty pages in order to explain the thing step by step. It was because they had to leave the matter to regulations that the Government did not specify every particular in this clause. If they did that they would have to put in a specimen form of claim, which was very important; and an hon. friend suggested that they should provide here an elaborate schedule as to the sort of questions which should be put to the applicant. That, again, was a matter for the regulations which would be prepared by the Department. Were there any words in the subsection to prevent the local pension committee asking for other information from another source?

Mr. LYTTELTON said that the words "from him" seemed to be specially directed to that point. He believed that they were inserted in order to prevent the local committee from themselves making inquiries which sometimes might be objectionable, and to confine them to the channel of the pension officer.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that these words were inserted there for a totally different purpose—to give the local authority the right to demand the services of the pension officer. If the words had not that effect as a matter of drafting, but had the effect which the right hon. Gentleman seemed to imagine they had, he would be perfectly willing to insert other words to make it quite clear that the local pension committee had perfect freedom to obtain information in any quarter. At the same time, he would have to consider whether the cutting out of those words would deprive the local authority of the right to command the services of the pension officer on their behalf.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN reminded the right hon. Gentleman of the argument of the Solicitor-General that the inclusion of one person excluded all others, and suggested that unless they put in such words as "and from such other people as they desire" the section would have an excluding effect.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that a question of drafting he would leave to his hon. and learned friend. The intention of the Government was, however, identical with that of the Leader of the Opposition and of the right hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square. He had fully decided that the pension committee should have the full right to make inquiries on their own authority. Of course, the committee must provide the machinery within the lines laid down by the Bill in order to carry the Bill into effect. He did not want to raise discussion on a subsequent clause, but if the hon. Baronet directed his attention to Clause 10 he would find most ample latitude there for regulations being prepared. He would like to say a few words in reply to the Questions put in the course of the discussion. As his hon. friend had said, the Government were not prepared to accept the Amendment, which would eliminate altogether the local element from the machinery of the Bill. That he did not think would be desirable. He agreed with some hon. Members opposite and certainly with his right hon. friend the Member for Forest of Dean, that undoubtedly the whole influence of the pension committee would be cast in favour of the applicant. It would be their desire in 99 cases out of 100 to see that the application was conceded in order to relieve the local rates and the committee from the obloquy and unpopularity of ruling out the claim of an applicant. Every claim ruled out would add to the rates. But he did not think that the pension committee would not do their duty. At the same time, their inclination would be, in the vast majority of cases, rather to rule in than to rule out. Therefore it was absolutely essential that there should be someone to represent the Treasury in the transaction. The hon. Gentleman opposite had made merry with the designation of "Imperial" officer; but he used the word in the sense of distinguishing Imperial from local, and not in order to give him any *status* he had not on his merits. It was essential to have some one representing and guarding the interests of the Treasury, for they could not leave it to a local body with no financial responsibility to make these allowances at the expense of another authority. The right hon. Gentleman had criticised the Government for nominating an Excise officer; could he suggest anyone else? The right hon. Member for East Worcestershire had made a suggestion, and he was glad to hear that, on the whole, the right hon. Gentleman approved of an Excise officer; the only stipulation being that he should not be appointed without any qualification or examination and should not be left to the exercise of the unlimited patronage of a political Party.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he was not so much enamoured of the Excise officer, but he could not find anyone else.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that was a great concession from the right hon. Gentleman, which he would translate into approval, and that on the whole the Government had done their best under the circumstances. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it was important that they should as far as possible utilise the services of men who came in by means of examination, and who had not the slightest degree or taint of political bias or corruption. He was informed that Excise officers were quite well qualified by education and adequate to discharge these functions; that they were sufficient in number and equal to their duties, especially if they were relieved of looking into the wastrel class. There had been one or two suggestions as to making use of relieving officers, but that had been repudiated by Members of all parties, and he did not think that beyond the one or two Members who made the suggestion anyone would go into the division lobby in favour of it. The relieving officer was mixed up with the Poor Law; not only that, he represented the local taxation authority, and was entirely the wrong kind of person to administer this great fund. What other officer was there who could be employed? They had only the Exciseman. He agreed with the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division of Sheffield that the ideal type of a man they wanted would be such as was found in the higher branches of the Excise service—such as a supervisor, or a surveyor of taxes in the Revenue service. He did not want to draw invidious distinctions or to say that they were quite of the same rank, but they were much too busy to add these functions to those they already discharged so well. They had, therefore, by a process of exhaustion and exclusion been driven back to the Excise officer. He did not take the view of the right hon. Gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, as to the qualifications of the Excise officer. He believed that they discharged very unpopular, invidious, and disagreeable functions very well.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he had never said anything against the Excise officer. What he complained of was that the whole thing was the Excise officer from beginning to end.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that inasmuch as he had shown that that was not the case, the right hon. Gentleman's complaint disappeared. He agreed that if it had been the Excise officer first, second, and third, there would have been ground for complaint; but, as a matter of fact, it was the Excise officer first, the pension committee second, and the representative of the Local Government Board third; therefore the solitary objection of the Leader of the Opposition to this machinery completely disappeared. That, therefore, was an answer to the charge.

The Excise officer was the only officer available for the purpose. He would report; the pension committee would sit on and examine and sift those reports, and decide upon them, and if necessary they would send for the applicant. In nine cases out of ten they would not send for the applicant, because it would not be necessary. Beyond that, it was the idea of the Government in framing the regulations to provide that where the pension committee decided against the applicant he should have an opportunity of appearing before them and making further representations before a final decision was arrived at. After that there certainly ought to be an appeal to the Local Government Board to vary the order. He agreed that that ought to be made perfectly clear, and if it was not perfectly clear from the words of subsection (*c*) he was quite prepared to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Woodstock which appeared further down on the Paper. In reply to the right hon. Gentleman opposite as to whether the reports of the committee should be published, he should say not. In New Zealand these inquiries were conducted with closed doors, and he thought it would be very undesirable under this Bill that the reports should be published. In certain circumstances they might create great unpleasantness. He did not think they ought to be published.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr-Tydvil) asked whether the appeal should not be widened so as to include the decision of the pension officer as well as the decision of the pension committee.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that raised a very much larger question, which was raised by a specific Amendment later. He would rather not argue that on this Amendment, upon which it did not quite properly arise. The other Amendment did raise the question of the interpretation of subsection (*c*).

Mr. LYTTELTON pointed out that in a case where a pension officer made an original report, and was afterwards required to supplement the information, if on that supplementary information the pension committee differed from the original report, there was no machinery for the pension officer to modify his first report. He thought there should be that power.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE agreed; he thought the pension officer should have that power. The report was the report as it stood after it had been decided upon. It was the final report. That was rather a different point, and there was no Amendment with regard to it. But if there was any doubt about the matter it should be made clear in the regulations, if not in the Bill itself. He had now dealt with all the points raised, and suggested that the Committee should now come to a decision on the Amendment. Having disposed of the question of whether they should have local committees or not, they could then proceed with the drafting Amendment.

Mr. BENNETT asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Leave refused, and Amendment negatived.

*Sir WALTER FOSTER moved an Amendment, the object of which was to substitute for the pension committee the stipendiary magistrate of the district, or, where there is no stipendiary magistrate, the County Court Judge, within whose jurisdiction the claimant or pensioner resides. He felt that in this matter they ought not to trust to any local body. They ought to have some procedure which would give everybody not only an opportunity of appealing but of appearing before a judicial officer and stating his case. It was quite possible that a committee constituted as proposed in the Bill might be a source of danger to the Exchequer. It might also exercise its functions in a way injurious to the locality. If, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had pointed out, this committee was to have a kind of roving commission to inquire into the character of every applicant for a pension they would have an inquisition of a most odious nature set up in every village and town in the country. It was because he thought that a committee of this kind might lead to a great deal of trouble that he preferred the simpler method embodied in his Amendment. According to his scheme the local pension officer would do the work under similar conditions to those which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had described. After the inquiry had been made the report would go to the official who would sit in court where he could deal with any appeal or statement on behalf of the applicant. There would be no working *in camera*. The whole thing would be done by an officer who would be in a position to act judicially and impartially, for he would be totally removed from local influences and above suspicion. The whole scheme with reference to the local pension committee was, in his opinion, bound to break down. When he had put this question before large audiences in rural districts they had told him that they did not wish to have these committees, and would not even trust their parish councils to carry out the measure. It was because he knew that feeling to exist that he begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 16, to leave out the words 'local pension committee, and the committee,' and to insert the words 'stipendiary magistrate of the district or where there is no stipendiary magistrate to the County Court Judge within whose jurisdiction the claimant or pensioner resides who.'"—(*Sir Walter Foster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'local pension committee and the committee,' stand part of the Clause."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he could not possibly accept the Amendment; to cause a man to appear before a local magistrate to apply for a pension would be open to a good deal of criticism. Neither a magistrate nor a County Court Judge could possibly attend to these thousands of cases in the first place, and, in the second, it would appear too much like litigation. It would be very undesirable to go before either a County Court Judge or a magistrate.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) was surprised to hear from the cheers of hon. Members opposite that they disapproved of this Amendment. If the pension was to be a matter of right, as he understood they claimed it should be, it was a question to be decided in open Court, and not by a committee sitting in secret or a pension officer in secret. That was exactly the difference between the procedure proposed by the Government and the procedure of the Amendment. By the judicial procedure the Court heard all the evidence on either side before arriving at a decision. Hon. Members opposite, in refusing the Amendment, were recording the opinion that these pensions were not a right, but a charity. ["No, no."] If they were a right why did they object to this kind of action being taken? The only way to try rights in this country was by judicial procedure. They would not try this by judicial procedure, but would try it by a secret committee and a department working in secret.

LORD R. CECIL said he was very much struck by the statement of the right hon. Gentleman who had moved the Amendment that he had found very large audiences objecting to these matters being considered by a committee. He quite agreed with the large audiences. Whether hon. Members below the gangway who assumed omniscience with regard to the opinions of the labouring classes were right, or whether the right hon. Gentleman was right he did not know, but he could understand the objection. The objection was this. The working-men of the country knew perfectly well, if they had considered this Bill at all, that it meant inquiry into their character for years and years past. They were not content that the inquiry should be made by a committee, even *in camera*, and even with all the astonishing machinery designed by the Government for this clause. He confessed he did not feel sure that an inquiry in open Court would be any more popular; he did not know that those who wished to have the pensions were really so anxious to have their whole character investigated before an open Court.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER said that his scheme would not work in that way at all. The pension officer would inquire into the whole of the case, and having made his report he would send to the magistrate or to the County Court Judge his recommendation. There would be no inquiry in open Court except in the case of an appeal against the decision. If the Judge granted the pension there would be no appearance in open Court. In case the decision was adverse to the applicant, he would have an opportiunity of going before the magistrate, whether in open Court or in private Court, and giving evidence on oath in favour of his claim.

LORD R. CECIL: said that the right hon. Gentleman accepted what appeared to him the chief vice of the Government scheme, namely, the enormous power put into the hands of the pension officer; in fact, the right hon. Gentleman said that the pension officer was to decide whether anybody was to have a pension in his district, and if anyone objected the remedy was an appeal in open Court. He could quite understand that a man with some passages in his life which he would not desire to have exposed in open Court would be content to forego his pension rather than appeal against a pension officer, who, in spite of everything the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, would have an absolute hold over these pensions. That was a matter for very serious consideration, and it seemed to him that the House ought not to give to these men the disposal of that vast patronage which the Government suggested. He certainly believed that no such suggestion had ever been made in any previous Act of Parliament, and he confessed that he should feel very great hesitation in accepting it. Then as to what the hon. Member for Preston had said, there was a great deal, as there always was, in what he had said, but he thought that the hon. Gentleman had forgotten that the German system did not involve inquiry into character.

*MR. HAROLD COX said he hoped that he had not beeen misunderstood. He had not said that he would support the Amendment. He had only said that hon. Gentlemen on the Labour Benches ought to support it.

LORD R. CECIL said he agreed in the criticism on the Labour Members, who had been misled by the ingenious phrasing of the first clause of the Bill. They really thought that the Government were giving this pension as a matter of right. They believed that that was said in the first clause. They either had not carefully read over the other clauses or they had been deluded by the Celtic eloquence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But if they once grasped that there was no right conferred by the Bill, if they once grasped that it was a matter entirely within the discretion of the pension officer, without a shadow of control by the local pension committee, then it appeared to him that they could not treat it as a right, and they could not have it discussed in Court at all; and the objection which the large audiences of the right hon. Gentleman felt to a discussion of the matter by a pension committee would be even greater than to a discussion in open Court. Therefore, he was afraid that he would not be able to support the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said that Labour Members considered it a very poor argument to have pointed out to them what was done in Germany. They were not built that way. Probably they would not stand a lot of things that were stood in Germany. He wanted the Committee to realise the kind of people they were legislating for. First of all, they were mainly workpeople, men and women, all of the age of seventy, and was it really suggested by the right hon. Gentleman on the other side that these old men and old women had to go before a magistrate with a wig on? ["No, no," and laughter]. Well, he had seen a stipendiary magistrate with a wig on. Were these old people to appear in a criminal court where cases were being tried, to await their turn either after or preceding a "drunk"? Failing a magistrate, they were to go before the County Court Judge—a Court of which many of them had never heard and which might be miles away from the little villages in which they lived. They were going to put all this trouble on those old people, when they got beyond the recommendation of the Excise officer. That was the position. He did not care much about inquiry, and he believed that the Bill would be better without some of it. But on the other hand he would rather put these poor people into the hands of a local committee who had known them nearly all their lives, to settle between their claims and the report of the pension officer. He thought that was the fairest plan. To take these people before a Judge of any description would simply mean that they would not go, but would do without the pension. They might get a few who had the bluff, the courage and effrontery to do it, but those who were really deserving of a pension would not go near the Court. The Bill already put sufficient obstacles in the way of these people getting the pension, and the Amendment if adopted would make the matter impossible.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) pointed out that the Bill applied to Scotland, where they had neither stipendiary magistrate nor County Court Judge, so that the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment would require to be amended if it was to apply to Scotland, and they would have to insert "sheriffs and sheriffs-substitute." He hoped that the House would not proceed with the Amendment, and if the right hon. Gentleman pressed it he should certainly vote against it. The Amendment really made nonsense of the Bill, and if it were carried as it was it could not possibly apply to Scotland.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he quite agreed that the Amendment was impracticable, and the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had pointed out that it would have to be profoundly modified in order to make it read properly in regard to all parts of the Kingdom to which it applied. He thought that the Government ought seriously to consider the point, however. The hon. Member for Clitheroe seemed to think that it would be a great hardship upon those who desired the pension that they should have to go before a magistrate. For his own part, he would like to have the judicial authority brought in if only to protect the people who were refused pensions. Under the Bill as it stood the man who could refuse to grant a pension was the Excise officer, who permeated the whole system up to the Local Government Board. Even with the modifications promised by the Government, it appeared to him that in the case of the Excise officer they would never have any efficient machinery for sifting and examining in favour of the applicant for a pension. The man who was unlucky in his Excise officer, or suspected that the Excise officer had made a mistake, would have no protection under the Bill as it stood, and he confessed that he would like an appeal. It seemed to him that persons who were refused pensions should have the opportunity to go before some judicial authority who would interpret the statutory rates which were now to be given to them.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.) said the hon. Member opposite objected to the Amendment because they had no magistrates in Scotland, but the Amendment was equally objectionable to Ireland, because there they had stipendiary magistrates, sometimes called resident magistrates, and he hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would stand firm in resisting the Amendment. He was rather astonished to hear from the other side of the House, in the case of some hon. Members, the extreme mistrust of local authorities in this country. In Ireland they had confidence in their county councils, and they would have confidence in the committees appointed by them. For these reasons he would be certainly compelled to vote against the Amendment.

*MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) said he had listened with considerable attention to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ilkeston, but, whether the County Court Judge with or the stipendiary without a wig, he did not think either would in any way meet the requirements of this particular case. There had been many suggestions as to the formation of the pension committee, but they knew from what had fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he considered that boards of guardians would not be proper persons to deal with this question of pensions, though these guardians, as private individuals, might have something to do with the question. In his opinion to leave the matter to the county council was to leave it to a body dealing with far too large an area.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That question comes upon Clause 8.

*MR. STAVELEY-HILL said he would not pursue that subject any further, but turn to the original point, which surely came within the scope of the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. There was one body who would be more efficient to deal with the question than the County Court Judge, and that was the district council. They knew the district, and the people knew them.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That should come on Clause 8.

*MR. STAVELEY-HILL said he was entitled to suggest an alternative to the proposal of the right hon, Gentleman. He objected to the stipendiary magistrate and to the County Court Judge, because they were persons who did not know these people, who could not in any way be concerned with their affairs, and would probably terrify them, whereas the rural district councils knew the people and were known by them.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER said he recognised the difficulty under which his hon. friends opposite laboured. He had great sympathy with them, and he also understood the difficulty in connection with Scotland. Under these circumstances he asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Leave refused, and Amendment negatived.

MR. HILLS (Durham) moved, as an Amendment, that the word "authority" should be substituted for "committee" where that word first occurs in subsection (*a*) of the clause. This proposal, he explained, was submitted as a preliminary step towards an Amendment which he wished to make in the next clause by appointing the registrar of births, marriages, and deaths in each district to act as the local pension authority. In his judgment a local committee of the county or district council was the very worst body that could be found to decide questions of this sort. All the investigations was carried on by the Excise officer, and the decision on the facts was in the hands of the local committee. That decision would be of great importance, for these authorities were bound to decide the cases on certain rules, a set of precedents would be set up, and the real decision and the interpretation of the Act in time would come into the hands of the pension authority. The objections to that were very great. The local committee knew the facts, and that was an advantage in certain cases, but it did not apply in the present case, for all the investigations were made by the pension officer and not by the local committee. In the second place, there might be some argument for the employment of a local committee if local funds were being administered, because the local committee would give economy of administration; but here no local funds were being administered, and on that ground there was no advantage in employing a local committee. On the other hand, the objections to a local committee were very great. He did not think the people whose past life was to be looked into cared for an investigation carried on by a local committee. In the case of the income-tax the right was often exercised of being assessed by Commissioners who were not local people. Then if they had these local bodies all over the country there were sure to be large differences between them, and there would be inequalities between different localities. One authority would interpret the Act in a liberal spirit, and another would place a stricter interpretation upon it. But if all pension authorities were officers subject to some sort of central control they would get uniformity of administration. In the country now, they could not get the people to serve on these committees and to do the work there was to do. There was far too much already, and if these committees were appointed they were perfectly certain to be Poor Law guardians, for the simple reason that there was no one else who could do the work. The registrars of births, deaths, and marriages were under the supervision of the superintendent registrar, and he suggested that he should be the central authority and the district registrar should be the local authority. At present they were very badly paid, and he quite agreed that if they were appointed for this work their pay must be increased. But there was the existing local organisation, and with extension and extra assistance they could carry on the work. At any rate, in his opinion, it was a far better scheme than any form of local elected committee, under which they were sure to get all sorts of improper electoral pressure. It was certain to be a test question at the elections, and that would be very unfortunate. As had been said already, the tendency of these committees would be to admit all applicants for pensions. They would not save the rates by refusing applicants, and they would gain a certain sort of reputation for generosity by including them.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 16, to leave out the first word 'committee,' and insert the word 'authority.'"—(*Mr. Hills.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'committee' stand part of the clause."

*MR. MASTERMAN said he thought the Amendment could be disposed of somewhat rapidly, largely owing to the fact that for the last three hours they had been debating practically the same point. All parts of the House had agreed tacitly when the Amendment of the hon. Member for Wiltshire was withdrawn that whatever criticisms might be advanced against local pension committees (and some of them were substantial criticisms), that this was the method by which they would have to work, reserving, of course, their constitution, and the appeal from them for later discussion. They did not intend after that discussion to sweep away the local pension committee and substitute something else for it. But the particular alternative suggested by the Amendment was an impossible one. They would have one official who technically was an official under the Poor Law paid for by the rates, in close proximity and perhaps in disagreement with another official who was an Imperial official. That surely would not make for the smooth and efficient working of the scheme. The local registrar, except for the fact that he possessed knowledge of births, marriages and deaths, had none of the qualifications which they hoped the local pension authority would have to mitigate or to modify the decision of the Exciseman. He had not the wide local knowledge nor the intimate acquaintance with the conditions of these people, and particularly he would not have the inclination which the pension authority would have to stand for the enlargement of the possibilities of claims as against the demand of the Treasury officer for economy and retrenchment. He hoped, therefore, the hon. Gentleman might see his way to withdraw the Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL said he shared the difficulty of the Secretary to the Local Government Board as to the proposal of his hon. friend, but it appeared to him there was this to be said, and it had not really been dealt with, that there was a great disadvantage in an elected authority dealing with these pensions. He rather agreed that they must have a local committee, and he trusted the Government would keep an open mind if they could, consistently with their natural affection for the drafting of their own Bill, as to whether the local committee should be ejected or appointed. That appeared to be a matter of very serious concern, because if they had to elect them they would have carried out all over the country very much the same kind of scene as had prevailed according to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House during the last two days.

MR. HILLS: I think the sense of the House is against me, therefore I will withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD R. CECIL moved to insert after "and" in line 16 "except where such claim or question has been originated by the pension officer." It was a pure machinery point. The provision of the clause was that any such claim or question should stand referred to the local pension committee, which should before considering the claim or question refer it for report and inquiry to the pension officer. That might be fair enough when it was started, but when it was a question not of a claim for a new pension but of whether a man was entitled to continue to receive his pension, who was to raise the question? Clearly not the applicant himself. It must be the pension officer. There was nobody else. It was surely rather ridiculous that, if he told the committee that a pensioner was no longer entitled to his pension, the matter should be again referred to him for further report and inquiry, as the Bill provided.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 16, after the word 'and,' to insert the words 'except where such claim or question has been originated by the pension officer.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR W. ROBSON said he did not like the words suggested, and he would suggest other words to meet the case on the Report stage. He thought the point might be met by the words "except in cases where the pension officer has already reported thereon."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN pointed out that a claim might originate with the pension officer, or come through his hands. If an applicant was an ignorant man who did not know how to draw up or present his claim, naturally he would go to the pension officer who would fill up his form and send in his claim.

MR. BOWLES thanked the Attorney-General for having met this point, because it was a matter of some importance. As they were all agreed surely the most convenient course would be to insert the words now.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR MAURICE LEVY moved an Amendment to insert after the word "question" the words "and within three days of its receipt." If the Government accepted this Amendment he hoped they would accept another Amendment which would compel the pension officer to make his report within fourteen days, and the committee to give their decision within fourteen days after receiving the report from the pension officer. This would give practically one month for decision, which he considered ample. When people reached seventy years of age it was essential there should be no unreasonable delay in deciding whether they were entitled to a pension.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 17, after the word 'question,' to insert the words 'and within three days of its receipt.'"—(*Sir Maurice Levy.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he quite sympathised with the object his hon. friend had in view, and it was very desirable that all the claims should be dealt with as soon as possible. He could not, however, accept the Amendment as it was desirable that a certain amount of elasticity should be retained.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. SMEATON moved an Amendment providing that there might be associated with the pension officer for the purpose of the inquiry "such other person as the committee may appoint." His object was not only to strengthen the machinery for inquiry, but also to provide an adequate check upon the pension officer who had to conduct these inquiries. There were matters he would have to inquire into which might offer temptations, and for the protection of this officer, the public, and the Exchequer, there ought to be some check kept upon the inquiries of the Excise officer. It must be remembered that the Excise officers were by no means highly paid; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day, in another connexion, had warned the House that these officers were to exercise an enormous patronage amounting to £7,000,000 annually. Was it not right to have some kind of check upon their private—for they would be private—inquiries and on their decisions—for they were, in practice, the deciding authorities? And, seeing how intricate were the subjects into which he had to inquire, was it not advisable to give him the assistance of an assessor? He thought it was a very serious matter to place the Excise officer in full charge of the inquiry, and make him the real responsible authority. They might appoint an assessor who would exercise a check upon this officer's operations. In the debate upon subsection (*c*) of Clause 4 he had ventured to make some remarks which were somewhat pooh-poohed by the right hon. Gentleman. He had pointed out that a pensioner might even own a house, a horse, or a donkey. The right hon. Gentleman said that had nothing to do with the case, and the only men he had to deal with were stocking-holders whose resources they had to fathom before granting the pension. It was these aged folk who had, the Chancellor said, hidden away a stocking full of pence or silver—it was these poor old folk who disturbed the right hon. Gentleman's sleep! These were his nightmare! Well, if there were any stocking-holders they ought to do their best to find them out. The old man might meet the pension officer at the front door, whilst the wife was taking out the stocking at the back door. In view of the great responsibilities placed upon the pension officer the temptation he was exposed to was enormous and his duties complicated and difficult. For those reasons he thought this Amendment deserved the serious consideration of the right hon. Gentleman. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 18, after the word 'officer,' to insert the words 'with whom may be associated for the purpose of the inquiry such other person as the committee may appoint.'"—(*Mr. Smeaton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR E. CARSON asked if the hon. Member proposed that all those people should make reports.

*MR. SMEATON: No, they should assist the pension officer, and act as assistants to him.

SIR E. CARSON: Suppose they did not agree with the pension officer?

*MR. SMEATON said in that case they might report their opinion or their view of the facts to the pension committee.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the cross-examination of the right hon. Gentleman was the best answer to the Amendment which contained an impossible proposition. How could they send an Excise officer to see if there was any stocking? He agreed with what was said by the right hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, as to the necessity for an Amendment of the Bill with reference to the pension officer, but he could not assent to the proposal in the Amendment that that officer should have certain men around him watching to see whether he was doing right or wrong.

LORD R. CECIL said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had denounced the Leader of the Opposition for having wholly misunderstood the Bill, and for suggesting that the pension officer was really supreme. Now the right hon. Gentleman admitted that the Bill was defective in drafting, and he was going to introduce an Amendment which would meet the criticism of his right hon. friend.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: To meet the views of the right hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square.

LORD R. CECIL said that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer preferred to give the credit to his right hon. friend the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, he might do so. It was admitted that the inquiries would be very difficult to carry out. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said there would be no great difficulty in finding out the age of an applicant. That would be a very difficult thing indeed. The right hon. Gentleman assumed that the applicants would necessarily be resident in country villages, and that everybody would know everything about them. As a matter of fact, a vast number would be people living in towns, of whom even their next door neighbours had little or no personal knowledge. The pension officer would have to find out who the applicant was, where he was born, and he would have to get some information as to his early history. He thought that they should give the pension authority power to appoint men, not to check the Excise officer, but in order to obtain additional information which the Excise officer might not be able to obtain. The Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to think that the Excise officer would be at the order of the local committee. That was not so. The Excise officer would not be bound to comply with a single direction of the local committee; he was not appointed or paid by them. The essential feature of this machinery was that the Exciseman should be an independent authority with no connection with the local committee at all. If the local committee desired further inquiries to be made and the pension officer did not make them, the committee would have no means of getting it unless the Bill was amended. The committee could not spend a halfpenny unless they were authorised by the statute to spend it. Under the Bill they had no power to obtain information of any sort except what they obtained from the pension officer. If the committee were to be given effective power to check the information they got from the pension officer, then power must be given to them in the statute to make inquiries, and, if necessary, to appoint an officer to make the inquiries. He would support the Amendment.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) said the Amendment would destroy the whole intention and character of the pension officer. If they gave the local committee power to appoint an officer independent of the pension officer they would cut away the whole principle involved in the matter. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a most effective reply in opposing the Amendment.

Mr. BOWLES said it seemed to him that, unless this Amendment or some Amendment having the same effect, was incorporated in the clause, the pension officer would be destroyed physically. He would be hopelessly overcome by the enormous work which would be piled upon him. What provision was there in the clause for giving the pension officer assistance in making the inquiries? There might be thousands of applicants in the area served by one Excise officer or, at any rate, by not very many officers. The labour of inquiring into the lives of all these people would be enormous. [An Hon. Member: That is provided for in Clause 8.] Subsection 4 of Clause 8 said—

> "Pension officers shall be appointed by the Treasury, and the Treasury may appoint such number of those officers as they think fit, to act for such areas as they direct."

That did not meet his point. The point was that the pension officer was carefully prevented from being assisted, and it appeared to him that duties would be put upon the officer which he could not possibly be expected to perform, and if they were not performed enormous expense would result.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said it was obvious that the duties to be performed in connection with the inquiries must rest upon the pension officer, and it would naturally be absurd to divide his responsibility. Repeated reference had been made in the course of the debate to the pension committee. He had some experience of local authorities, and he was inclined to think that they would go far wrong if they relied on the efficiency of the local committee. Everything would depend on the officer.

Mr. MADDISON (Burnley) hoped his hon. friend would withdraw the Amendment. If the intention was to give the pension officer assistance that was already provided for. The power conferred by subsection (4) of Clause 8 would enable the Treasury to appoint such number of pension officers as they thought fit. There was no specific number stated in the Bill, and surely if an Exciseman had too large a district, provision could be made to meet the requirements of the case. He thought the Treasury might be trusted to provide sufficient men.

*Mr. SMEATON said he was sorry the intention of the Amendment had been so completely misinterpreted. The question of responsibility was very important indeed, but he maintained that responsibility would be divided if there were two or three Excise officers in charge of a district in precisely the same way as if they were to associate with each officer such other person as the committee might appoint. He regretted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the airy way he had got into, had spoken as if this Amendment was brought forward for obstructive purposes. He repudiated that entirely. If this was the way the right hon. Gentleman was going to treat private Members who were at last trying their humble best to improve the Bill, he would be discouraging instead of encouraging private Members to help him; and the day might come when he might regret it. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave withdrawn.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE moved to insert in subsection (*b*) words enabling the local pension committee to obtain information not only from the pension officer but "from any other source."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 23, after the word 'information,' to insert the words 'from any other source.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LYTTELTON thought those words carried out quite sufficiently the object he had in view, viz., that the pension committee should have power to make inquiries independently of the pension officer, if they thought it necessary.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said the Amendment authorised the local committee to obtain information from some other source if they were not satisfied with that given by the pension officer. But could they appoint an official through whom that information could be obtained? An immense amount of inquiry would have to be made which would not be of a local character. The pension committee would be obliged to get particulars of a man's past history away from the parish where he now resided. He saw the Attorney-General for Ireland present. That right hon. and learned Gentleman would correct him if he was wrong, but he was certain that seventy years ago there was no organised system of registration of births in Ireland; and it would be practically impossible to ascertain the date of birth of many persons in Ireland of the artisan class. Sources of information of that character other than the pension officer would have to be available to the pensions committee. He thought it would have been simpler and wiser to have authorised, by the Amendment, the pension committee to obtain regular assistance for the purpose of making those outside inquiries. The hon. Member for Burnley rather misapprehended the difficulty of securing a sufficient number of pension officers when he said that if more were required they would be appointed. That did not follow at all.

MR. MADDISON: Why not?

LORD BALCARRES said that for years the Local Government Board had been pressing upon the Treasury the desirability of appointing a certain particular class of officials to carry out a certain statutory obligation, and the Treasury had refused to appoint them. Again, at present the Home Office had an application for a certain number of officials to carry on work connected wish that Department, but the Treasury refused. He could quite readily see that the Treasury might say to the local pension committee that official assistance to carry out their inquiries would cost too much money and the local pension committee would find themselves thrown overboard.

MR. MADDISON said that in these cases surely it would be to the interest of the Treasury to appoint the officials.

LORD BALCARRES said that the answer might be "the more Excise officers the more expense." However, if information was to be obtained from other sources than the pension officer, then somebody ought to be appointed to make the investigations which would not be local. An applicant's history was to be traced back to the time he was twenty years of age and inquiries made as to whether he had worked according to his capacity and need, and he might have worked in many different parishes throughout the country.

Lord R. CECIL said he would like the Chancellor of the Exchequer to say whether in his judgment the words would authorise the appointment of someone on behalf of the pension committee to make the further inquiries if they thought it necessary. The Excise officer might come to the pension committee and say: "I have done my best to make inquiries, but I have not been able to find out this man's past history, or to trace his character. I have lost trace of him in some particular places, and I should like to know a little more about him before I definitely decide on my report. I should like to know something more locally as to whether he has funds or property." Or the Excise officer might be bad or incompetent, and the local pension committee would have no power to appoint another. He, therefore, wanted to know whether the local pension committee could not put anybody to make inquiries unless they were expressly authorised to pay for them. He knew that there was a subsection of Clause 10 which gave power to pay the expenses of carrying out the Act, but it was essential to know whether that gave power to the local pension committee to do a particular thing not mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that, of course, the Treasury would not give sanction to the appointment of any number of officers, but only such officers as were necessary to discharge the functions which came under the purview of the section. He could not see why there should not be the appointment of the officers mentioned by the noble Lord. He thought it was quite clear that the pension committee would have at their disposal sufficient pension officers to make further inquiries. That was the object of the clause. The noble Lord suggested the case of an incompetent local pension officer. He had no doubt that the pension committee might on occasion require an assistant and in that case the Treasury would sanction the expense.

Amendment agreed to.

Lord Balcarres.

Mr. BOWLES moved to insert the words "providing that the committee should hear the claimant if requested to do so by him or thought desirable by the Committee." The Amendment seemed to him to be very reasonable, indeed absolutely essential unless the whole administration of the Bill after it became an Act was to be handed over to the pension officer. As the Bill stood at present, the only person to whom the applicant could apply, the only person he was to see throughout the proceedings and to whom he could tell his own story, was the Exciseman. He could make no appeal to the pension committee or to the President of the Local Government Board or even to the world outside. One did not want to suggest anything of the kind, but either through incompetency, lack of judgment, or for a thousand other reasons, the pension officer might be unmoved by the statement of the applicant. The man would be absolutely at the mercy of the Exciseman, and there was nothing in the Bill to ensure that the man would have a fair hearing. That might result, and probably would, in considerable injustice being done to the applicant. Further, it involved putting the pension committee in a position entirely false and almost impossible. The pension committee would rely in fact on the reports of the pension officer. The whole point about the pension committee was that it was a local committee. It would very likely have a member or two upon it who would know all the circumstances. But the whole of that advantage would be destroyed if the man was not to be allowed to appear before them, and they were to confine themselves to the paper reports drawn up by the pension officers. It would make an enormous difference in the case of an honest *bona fide* applicant against whom the pension officer or one of the county council committee had a grudge. It would be of tremendous importance to him to be able to say: "If you doubt what I say I shall claim to appear before the pension committee, and make my case good so far as I can." It would have a great effect on the committee, and certainly obviate cases of real injustice. He did not much like the Bill, but if pensions were to be given it was essential, if they were to be given as a matter of right, that the man should not have that right controlled by a third person, and be prevented from coming before the pension committee and making his case good. The point was clear and appeared to be important, and he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would see his way to concede it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 24, after the word 'question,' to insert the words 'and after hearing the claimant, if requested to do so by him or thought desirable by the Committee.'"—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE agreed that the applicant ought to have the right to present his case before the committee before the pension was refused, but argued that it was obviously unnecessary for him to come before the committee if his pension was to be granted. All these questions would be dealt with by regulations. As he had explained earlier in the debate it was the intention of the Government by regulations not only to give the committee power to send for the applicant, but also to give the applicant power to go before the committee, if necessary, to establish his claim. The whole matter required great consideration, but he did not think it was a matter which should appear even in rough outline in the Bill itself. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would withdraw the Amendment, which in any case was much too wide. In nine out of ten cases these claims would be decided without difficulty and the pension would be given. He thought before applicants were allowed to go before the committee notice should be given to them that their application had been refused. The applicant should then be allowed to go before the committee in support of his own application.

AN HON. MEMBER said he agreed with a good deal of what the right hon. Gentleman had said. If this point could be dealt with by regulations that would be the best way of dealing with it. What he felt, however, was that the clause was so drawn that there would be no power to deal with these matters by regulations. Subsection (*a*) said that the committee, before considering the claim, should refer it for report and inquiry to the pension officer, and subsection (*b*) said that the local pension committee should, on the receipt of that report, consider the case and give their decision. He did not think they had power to see the applicant.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that if the hon. Member looked a little further at Clause 10 he would find that it said that the Treasury might make regulations for prescribing the manner in which claims to pensions might be made, and the procedure to be followed on the consideration and determination of claims and questions by pension officers, local pension committee, or central pension authority.

THE HON. MEMBER said he could not quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman, because Section 7 had already laid down the procedure and could not be altered by regulation. This body was set up as a kind of judicial body, and was bound to proceed according to its constitution. Regulations could not be made to nullify the procedure specifically stated in an Act of Parliament. Everybody agreed as to the advantage of the Amendment. He only desired to put before the right hon. Gentleman the difficulties.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that if there was any doubt at all about it he thought it ought to be made perfectly clear what the intention of Parliament was. In any case he thought these words would not meet the difficulty, and if the Amendment was withdrawn at this stage a form of words might be considered before the Report Stage.

LORD R. CECIL said that if the right hon. Gentleman only read the wording of the clause he would at once see the difficulty that was felt by the Committee. Subsection (*b*) was imperative. It said the pension committee "shall," on receipt of the report of the pension officer, and so on, consider the application and give their decision. He quite agreed that the proper way to deal with this matter was by regulations, but he contended that the foundation for those regulations must be laid in this clause. Some words were really essential if they were to have the power taken in Clause 10.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE quite agreed that the matter was one for consideration. He thought it was entirely a matter of drafting, but if words were necessary to make absolutely clear the fact that regulations could be brought in to deal with this point he would be happy to insert some words.

MR. McARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale) contended that the whole point was that, inasmuch as the applicant himself was the source of all information, the pensions committee had a perfect right to demand his attendance and hear all he had to say; but he thought some words were necessary to enable the applicant to assert his right to go before the committee and state his case before his claim was finally rejected.

MR BOWLES said that after the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman opposite he had no desire to put the Committee to the trouble of a division. He, therefore, begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD R. CECIL said the House would agree that the Amendment he now proposed to move was of importance, but whether the right hon. Gentleman would accept it was a different matter. He had slightly modified it and it would read as follows: "Provided that a local pension committee may, and if the committee refuse a pension shall, if required, state a case on any question arising as to the claim to a pension for the opinion of the High Court, and the High Court shall accordingly give its opinion thereon, and the local pension committee or central pension authority, as the case may be, shall determine such question in accordance with such opinion." The object of the Amendment was to give an applicant the right to have any question of law raised by his claim determined by a Court of law, and to give the pension committee, if they should be in any doubt as to the meaning of the Act—a not improbable contingency—the right to obtain the guidance of the High Court, and ask their opinion upon any question as to the construction of the Act. If it was thought more desirable to substitute the County Court for the High Court, he saw no great objection to that; but his experience was that proceedings in the High Court were not really more expensive than in the County Court in this kind of matter. It was merely a question of stating a case for the opinion of the High Court. The opinion would be obtained, and the matter would be disposed of in that way. The procedure had been adopted in a large number of cases and had been found to work satisfactorily. He could see no objection to the proposal, except that of expense. He quite agreed there was that objection, but there were only two cases to which the Amendment applied. First, there was the case of refusal of a pension where there might be some great principle involved in the construction of the Act; and that would rule a vast number of others; secondly, there was the case where the local pension committee was genuinely in doubt what was the law, and in which any legal expenses incurred would be borne by the Treasury, no expenditure being thrown upon the applicant. Personally, he would not support a proposal which would give the pension officer the right of appeal against the allowance of a claim. Surely, however, if the pension committee or the central authority felt genuine doubt as to whether they had not gone wrong, it was not unreasonable to give the power of going to the High Court to ascertain what was the real meaning of the statute. At present it appeared to him that under the Bill, as it was drawn, every difficulty would be put in the way of an applicant for a pension. He was frankly against the Bill, and he disapproved of it; but it seemed to him that hon. Members should not pretend to support it and really withdraw it by the machinery imported into it. He, therefore, wished the pension to be a genuine one and that it should not be filched away by any chicanery or departmental red tape.

At present, the whole thing was in the hands of the Department. There was no appeal at all from the Department. The pension officer was an officer of the Government, and, if the pension committee disagreed with him and allowed a pension, there was appeal to the central authority, which was the Local Government Board. The whole thing, therefore, was absolutely and entirely in the hands of the Local Government Board. He did not think that that was a satisfactory system; there ought to be some control over the Local Government Board. He very much disapproved of excessive centralisation. It was one of the besetting sins of modern legislation, and the result was that, partly by perversity and partly by folly, the Departments destroyed what was really intended to be done by the statute, and destroyed it privately and secretly. It was not like a Court which went wrong, and where the matter could be put right by a small amending Act. If a Department went wrong, they were faced with two difficulties. First, they did not generally know what the Department had done, and in the second place the very person they wished to set right was on the Treasury bench with all the apparatus of the Whips and with sheep behind him to destroy any attempt to over-rule his decision. They, therefore, placed themselves absolutely in the hands of the politician who happened to be the head of the Department. He knew it was very difficult to convince the Government, but he asked the Committee seriously to consider whether this Amendment should not be adopted. He did not want to embitter the discussion, but he would ask hon. Gentlemen opposite to imagine the time when they would be in Opposition and a wicked and perverse Tory Government in power who would do their best, as hon. Gentlemen believed, to destroy this beneficial Act; and to conceive the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London holding high office in that Tory Government and having to administer this Act? Would it not be a comfort to them to know then they would have the opportunity of taking the matter to the High Court as to whether his decision on the meaning of the Act was right or wrong? He, therefore, asked the Committee to consider very carefully and impartially the desirability of this Amendment.

Amendment proposed.

"In page 4, line 25, at the end, to insert the words, 'provided that a local pension committee may, and, if the committee refuse a pension, they shall, if required, state a case on any question of law arising as to the claim to a pension for the opinion of the high court, and the high court shall accordingly give its opinion thereon, and the local pension committee or central pension authority, as the case may be, shall determine such question in accordance with such opinion.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he was not in agreement with his noble friend. He agreed with him as to the danger which he had pointed out existed in the Bill as it stood, but he had not been able to convince himself, nor had his noble friend's speech convinced him, that the course proposed by him was the best way of meeting the difficulty. Under the Bill as it stood, in the event of disagreeement between the pension officer and the pension committee, there was an appeal to the central authority, which was the Local Government Board. He viewed with great jealousy, and he thought he might say with great anxiety, the attribution to the Local Government Board of such vast powers as were involved in these provisions. His vote would be influenced by what the Government intended under the name of the Local Government Board, and he would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to tell them how the Government intended that the Local Government Board should carry out its functions in this matter. If the President of the Local Government Board, a political officer, was to decide on the merits of individual cases, then he thought there was an overwhelming case for some appeal to a Court of law. The Chancellor of the Exchequer agreed with him a little time ago when he suggested that anything which raised the suspicion of political bias on the part of the local pension officer would be most detrimental to the working of the Bill, and he thought it would be so if anything raised the suspicion of political bias on the part of the central authority to whom the appeal must go. If the Government would make it clear that it was the intention that the Local Government Board should appoint an independent officer to judge these questions independently and in a judicial way, though not being actually a judicial officer, then he did not think they need have this appeal to the Court. Did the Government intend to act in that way? He would give an illustration. The Registrar of Friendly Societies, he imagined, was appointed and could be removed from office by the First Lord of the Treasury. Very serious duties had been imposed upon him: for instance, that of certifying under the Workmen's Compensation Act in regard to schemes of contracting out. He was an official of the Government, but in deciding all such cases he acted in a judicial capacity, and it would be an improper and practically, he might say, an impossible thing for any Member of the Government of the day to issue to him instructions as to how he should decide in any particular case. There must be power to issue such general instructions as were contemplated in Clause 10 which would be binding to a certain extent upon an officer in an independent position such as he had described. He would view with the gravest mistrust and alarm the power of the Board of Trade or the practice of the President to interfere in particular cases. It ought not to be left to a political officer. It might be left to an officer appointed by him, but that officer ought to be recognised as holding a judicial position, judging on his own authority, and not directed to find this, that, or the other, or to have his decision in a particular case upset by the Parliamentary officer for the time being. The way in which the Government answered that question would affect his vote on this Amendment.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said his difficulty in answering the right hon. Gentleman's very pertinent and sensible question, which he would have no difficulty in answering to his satisfaction, was that it really arose on the next subsection and the very next Amendment. He was rather afraid from his experience of the noble Lord's methods that if he answered him on this Amendment it would enlarge the whole scope of the discussion, and he did not want to do that. He agreed absolutely with the right hon. Gentleman that this officer must be quite independent. The officers now appointed by the Local Government Board to inquire into local loans and questions of that kind were absolutely independent; there never was the slightest suspicion that they were influenced by political considerations. That was the kind of officer they proposed to appoint here.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked whether the officer's decision would require approval in particular cases by the President.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the right hon. Gentleman would be the very last to say that the President of the Local Government Board should never intervene. He was very anxious that the Bill should be drafted in a way which would make litigation impossible. There was a Court of Appeal, viz., Parliament. The noble Lord had tried to rush them into millions of expenditure and had succeeded to the extent of £200,000 or £300,000 and was delighted with it, he was sure.

Lord R. CECIL said the right hon. Gentleman had made that charge several times, and it was quite inaccurate. He had made no speech in favour of any of the extending Amendments except the one as to right, nor had he voted in favour of any of them.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was under the impression that the noble Lord had spoken in favour of almost every extending Amendment. If the Local Government Board and the Treasury interpreted the Act in a narrow, near, shabby, restricted sense, there was always Parliament, and it was far and away better to depend on Parliament than to go up to a Divisional Court to interpret the provisions of the Act. Nothing would suit the Treasury better than to be able to say: "We are very sorry. We cannot grant it. The Courts will not allow us." Whenever there was any difficulty at all it would be referred to the Judges, and they would say that it did not come within the four corners of a particular section. But when they came to deal with Parliament, they had to deal with merits. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would see that it was very much better that they should trust to an independent officer of the Local Government Board as a Court of Appeal rather than go to a Court of law.

MR. BOWLES said the answer of the right hon. Gentleman was altogether inadequate to the Amendment. His noble friend suggested that the applicant should be able to require the committee refusing a pension to state a case for the High Court. The right hon. Gentleman said that that was quite unnecessary; it would be settled in a back room at Whitehall, and if anybody disliked the settlement there would be no need to complain, because the whole thing could be re-tried and re-heard right through—where ? In that House. No injustice, no doubt, no trouble, no inconvenience, need be feared in leaving the whole determination of the question to officials in back rooms in the Treasury and the Local Government Board, because, said the right hon. Gentleman, behind them there was the House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman knew as they all did that the decision of the Local Government Board upon these matters, however wrong in law, could not, in fact, be effectively questioned in that House or anywhere else than in open Court. It really seemed to him that more nonsense, if one might say so in a Parliamentary sense, was talked about the power and capabilities of the House in matters of this kind than about almost any other subject. Everyone knew it was perfectly illusory to suggest that where a poor old man had been refused a pension upon some ground of law which was in extreme doubt, it could be dealt with by any proceeding possible to any Member of the House. The truth was, as all of them had seen and many of them had said, that the increasing tendency in these days was to go on piling up powers in the back rooms of the Department in Whitehall, and to pretend to the people and to the House that it was all right, because the House existed to carry out functions which it could not discharge. It had been said that democracy was merely another word for bureaucracy, and they were seeing every day enormous extensions of the pretensions and powers of the bureaucrat. He entirely objected to that, particularly when, as in this case, and in almost every case, that extraordinary extension of bureaucratic powers was defended as being really quite harmless. There could be no doubt that this Amendment really ought to be added to the Bill, and he hoped some friend of liberty and enemy of mere bureaucratic government in matters of this kind, untempered in any way, would rise to support the Amendment.

MR. McARTHUR said that this was a matter on which he had felt for some time very strongly, though he had been a silent listener to the proceedings on the Bill. It appeared to him to be one which pre-eminently demanded that there should be arranged some way of invoking the authority of a Court of law in respect to it. He had never witnessed a Bill which had been so hastily drawn and so full of ambiguities. There was not a line, hardly a word, in the Bill which was not full of ambiguity. Of course that remark applied to some clauses more than others. Clause 3 was full of ambiguity which would lead to diversity of treatment by different authorities. He could not help feeling that the Bill, in its present form, would have the most demoralising effect on the public mind. It was eminently necessary to have an impartial authority to which anyone might appeal to consider the clauses of the Bill and determine any point of difficulty. There was the central authority and the pension committee, and neither of them would be able to take a legal view of the Bill. It was most desirable that a ruling should be obtained on any doubtful point.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) asked if the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to proceed with the Amendment he had referred to.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he could not make any statement then.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 46; Noes, 267. (Division List No. 155.)

AYES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord. R. (Marylebone. E.
Craig,Captain James (Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw,William J.MacGeagh
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Parkes, Ebenezer
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Renton, Leslie
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Stanier, Beville
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Valentia Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. M'Arthur and Mr. Bridgeman.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinstd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
GurdonRt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis(Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Wason
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen, W
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St, Pancras,E
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David

Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
McCrae, George
McLaren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Micklem, Nathanial
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montague, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, J. P.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberston, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

*Mr. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.) moved to leave out subsection (*c*) and insert: "The decision of the local pension committee allowing or refusing a claim for pension or determining any question referred to them shall, on the application of any person aggrieved or the pension officer be referred to the central pension authority, and shall be considered and determined by them." He submitted that under the Bill as drafted both the pension officer and the committee would be placed in a somewhat novel and unsatisfactory relationship to one another. The proposal in the Bill was not expedient from the point of view of either party. He did not think it was right to make by statutory enactment the position of the pension officer himself so absolutely independent of the committee, and further he thought it was very inadvisable to deprive the committee of the responsibility which ought to be on their shoulders rather than on those of a Government official. If they wished, as he believed they did, to obtain the services of good and responsible men on the pension committees, he felt certain that Parliament ought not to place them in that position. There were many men who would say they would not serve on the committee under such conditions. He proposed, therefore, to achieve the same object as the Government intended, but by different means. The principle of his proposal was that the Excise officer should be first, the committee second, and the Local Government Board third. The aggrieved person could then appeal from the pensions committee to the Local

Government Board. The procedure would thus be, first, a report would be made to the committee by the officer; then the committee would deal with the officer's report; then, in case of a dispute, there would be an appeal to the Local Government Board by the claimant or by the pensions officer as the case might be.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 26, to leave out subsection (*c*), and to insert the words '(*c*) The decision of the local pension committee allowing or refusing a claim for pension or determining any question referred to them shall, on the application of any person aggrieved, or the pension officer, be referred to the central pension authority, and shall be considered and determined by them.'"—(*Mr. Dickinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, down to the end of line 26, stand part of the clause."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that in the debate which took place at the beginning of the proceedings that afternoon hon. Members impressed on the Government the desirability of giving an appeal to the person aggrieved in addition to the appeals already provided for in the Bill. A good deal of pressure was brought to bear on the Government to concede that appeal, and he desired to assent to the Amendment of his hon. friend. There was a good deal to be said for it. His hon. friend had put the case very lucidly, and it was not necessary for him to say anything further. He did not know whether it would involve much more expense, but it would give a sense of confidence to the people of the country. Practically there would be three different authorities to deal with the cases. First of all, there was the Excise officer. If they were entirely dependent upon him, there would always be the fear that on account of personal or social considerations a case might not be properly considered. Then there was the local committee, and in their case there would be the suspicion that political prejudices would affect their judgment. Under the Amendment of his hon. friend an aggrieved person would be able to come to the Local Government Board, which would appoint an officer who knew nothing of the local trouble and prejudices to go down and inquire. That officer would sit like a revising barrister and consider the appeals that came up for decision. He thought that would give a greater sense of security and confidence, and what was more, a greater sense of independence. The local workman, artisan, or labourer would feel that he was not altogether dependent on the caprice, prejudice, or predilection of any persons, great or small, in his district when he could appeal and go beyond them. Even if there was the conspiracy of the local parson and squire against an applicant, as his hon. friend feared there might be in some cases, the applicant would know that he could go beyond them and have his case considered.

Sir E. CARSON, while agreeing with the Government, wished to make sure that the expression "person aggrieved" applied to the claimant, and would not give an aggrieved taxpayer, who objected to pensions as likely to increase his taxes, the right of appeal.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that was not the intention, and if the Committee would accept the words of the Amendment in the meantime, he would undertake that on report any alteration which the draughtsman considered necessary to make the intention clear should be made.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) said he could not understand why the words "person aggrieved" should be used at all. Why not use the word "claimant"? It would be better to settle this matter now than at a future time.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that a man who had had a pension might have been struck off. He might be an aggrieved person, and the right of appeal should extend to cases of that kind.

Sir F. BANBURY said the words "any person aggrieved" must include every person who had a grievance. He hoped one of the law officers would state whether the words in the Amendment would include a taxpayer who might be aggrieved. A taxpayer might claim the right to go before the Local Government Board and say: "I am an aggrieved person, because I believe this pension has been granted in error, that the facts of the case as stated by the applicant are not true, and that he has not fulfilled all the statutory duties." He was in favour of the Amendment as explained by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but he thought the word "claimant" should be put in to meet the point which had been raised.

Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich) said that the Labour Members were obliged to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for accepting this Amendment. It embodied the principle of an Amendment which stood in his own name. It was desirable that the claimant should have an appeal. At present they did not know whether the local pension committee was to consist of elected people, or of people entirely outside the local governing bodies. He wished to know whether in these cases a taxpayer who desired to protect the public purse would have the right of appeal against the granting of a particular pension.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that that was not intended, and, if necessary, words would be introduced to make that clear.

Mr. GEORGE ROBERTS asked whether these words covered the right hon. Gentleman's intention or not.

Mr. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton) said they were all agreed that those interested in the question should have a right of appeal. It had been conceded that the pension officer and the pension committee should have a right of appeal; but he could conceive circumstances in which it might be desirable that a member of the pension committee, who felt himself aggrieved, should also have a right of appeal.

Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. WALTER LONG said he did not wish to say anything as to the position in which the clause stood now in relation to the Amendment, for he was not quite clear on the matter. While they, on that side of the House, fully acknowledged that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had done his best to meet some points, they thought that the right hon. Gentleman had left the clause in an extremely unsatisfactory position. He believed that the clause was left in an impossible condition. The duties and powers thrown on the pension committee were still undefined. Generally he thought the Committee had tried to make the clause workable. He spoke in no sense as a Party man, but as one who had been for many years at the Local Government Board, and he did not believe that the machinery devised through the committee and pension officer would be workable. He could not understand how the Local Government Board would act as a Court of Appeal. While he was not in the House he was told that the right hon. Gentleman had said that these appeals would be dealt with by the general inspectors, and that they would decide them in the same way in which they decided other cases. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would tell him by whom these cases would be dealt with.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that what he had stated was that machinery would be constructed for the purpose.

Mr. WALTER LONG said that he had served at the Local Government Board for eleven years and, therefore, he knew the work probably better than anyone now in the House. It was of no use talking to him about machinery. Machinery could easily be provided by the permanent officials for anything. What he wanted to know was who were the officials in the Department to whom these matters were to be referred? The Secretary to the Local Government Board said the work was to be done by machinery that was to be devised.

That made the matter all the more unsatisfactory. The Committee ought to know what was the method by which these cases were to be decided in the future. They had, first of all, the application to the pension committee; secondly, the investigation by the pension officer; and thirdly, if there was disagreement, there was to be a reference to the central pension authority, which was defined as the President of the Local Government Board. The case could then only be dealt with in one of two ways. First, that the President of the Local Government Board for the time being would have the right to give his decision in every case. Did the Committee realise what was meant by that? The President of the Local Government Board had at present more work to do in the way of administration than the head of any other Department in the Government. More cases came before him for his personal decision than before the head of any other Department. It might be that there would be very few cases of appeal. He agreed that the general tendency would be to grant the pensions and not to refuse them; but supposing there were a great number of appeals, how were they going to be decided? Were they to be decided by reference to one of the sub-departments of the Board which would advise on the general law; or were they to be referred to the legal department? The President of the Local Government Board would be compelled to say: "Here is a statute which gives the right to a pension and imposes certain limitations. My business is to refer the case to the legal adviser of the Board to see whether the statute has been complied with or not." Was that the position which the President of the Local Government Board was to take up? It was not unreasonable that they on that side of the House should ask what procedure the Government proposed to adopt when they talked of referring to the head of a Government Department this extremely difficult and unpopular duty. Everybody knew how difficult it was for the head of the Department at present to control local authorities, even where he had a right to sanction or refuse expenditure by them. But here the whole of the money was coming from the State, and if differences arose between the pension officer and the local committee, and these were referred to the head of the Local Government Board, surely the Committee and the country ought to know how the power of deciding these differences was going to be exercised. They had been informed that the appeal cases were to be referred to the general inspectors; but he ventured to say that these general inspectors were not charged with any duties which would enable them to come to a decision. Their business would be to report to the head of the Department with whom the decision would ultimately rest. He was driven to the conclusion that when these differences occurred, and it was left in the hands of the head of the Board to decide them and to exercise all this patronage, not even an angel from Heaven would discharge the duty without a great deal of adverse criticism, or with any possible hope of doing justice to the case. He could not know the facts, or have the knowledge possessed by the local committee. It would, he insisted, be wise, even now, at the eleventh hour to get rid of this appeal. If there was to be an appeal at all, let it be to a Court of law; but it would be better still to leave it to the Excise officer or the local committee and absolve the head of the Local Government Department from a duty which he could not possibly perform. Believing, as he did, that the clause was a thoroughly bad clause, and would operate unjustly, he should certainly vote against it.

SIR F. BANBURY said it could not be denied that this was the most important part of the Bill. The Committee must remember that this clause gave most extraordinary powers to people who in his opinion were not fit to exercise them. The real person who under this clause would exercise the patronage of giving old-age pensions to certain people was the Excise officer. He would have to inquire into any number of circumstances and considerations with regard to the lives of the persons claiming the pensions, and, as had been pointed out by the hon. Member for Norwood, an extraordinary number of inquiries would have to be made before he would recommend the pension. Excise officers, whose salary by the way was £100 to £150 a year, were excellent men in their way, but he did not think they were fitted by their training to exercise the very difficult duties that would be put upon them under this Bill, especially after a few years of Radical Government. The right hon. Gentleman had himself admitted that, because he had said the duties were duties which should be performed by Inland Revenue supervisors. The next point to which he would draw attention was the local pension committee.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich), on a point of order, asked whether the hon. Member was in order in discussing the local pension committee on this clause, and so preventing the House from getting on to Clause 8, which dealt with these committees.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that in discussing the duties of these committees, with which Clause 7 dealt, the hon. Baronet was quite in order, but he could not discuss the constitution of those committees.

SIR F. BANBURY said the duties of the committees would be to inquire into all the circumstances of the case and investigate the report of the pension officer with regard to the person claiming a pension, but they could not decide the matter; they could only report to the Local Government Board. The real dictator was the President of the Local Government Board. As a matter of fact, this was going back to the old practice of the Star Chamber. An official appointed theoretically by the King was to have the power to say whether 500,000 people in the country should or should not have pensions. [Cries of "Divide, divide," and counter cries of "Order, order."]

MR. CROOKS: You make more speeches than all the other Members of the House put together.

SIR F. BANBURY: That is no reason for dividing. [Cries of "It is an absolute waste of time" and "Let him talk."]

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must appeal to hon. Members below the gangway to allow the hon. Baronet to speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is always at it.

MR. CROOKS: May I ask you, Sir, whether this painful repetition is to go on and keep us from Clause 8 until the closure? It is abominable.

SIR F. BANBURY made repeated attempts to proceed, amid renewed cries of "Divide." He declared that hon. Gentlemen were mistaken if they supposed he was to be browbeaten. However much noise they made, they could not prevent him standing there. He believed in free speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: And plenty of it.

MR. CROOKS: All your own.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I really must appeal to hon. Members below the gangway. Our proceedings must perforce stop at half-past ten o'clock. There is no possible use in interfering with the hon. Baronet.

MR. CROOKS: That is just our position. If the time is to be wasted we may as well waste it like this.

SIR F. BANBURY said he would conclude his remarks by expressing the wish that the right hon. Gentleman would give them some information upon the point raised by his right hon. friend.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the point raised by his right hon. friend was really one of great importance. During the dinner hour he addressed the same question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The central authority was the Local Government Board or somebody whom they might appoint. What did the Government intend to be the practice in deciding these cases? The Government by the acceptance—quite rightly—of the Amendment just moved had widened the scope of the appeal to the central authority, making that authority even more important than it was under the original Bill. He wanted to know what was the Local Government Board for this purpose. When he put the question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he replied that the questions would be referred to gentlemen in a position similar to that of the general inspectors, under the Board. He was not conversant with the working of the Board, and he did not know exactly what that meant, but he learned from his right hon. friend that these inspectors did not decide anything in the matters confided to them. They occasionally advised the local authority, and they constantly reported to the President, but in no cases did they themselves give a decision. Therefore, if that analogy was followed, the inspectors might report to the President of the Local Government Board, but it was the President himself who would have to determine in every individual case that came before him whether on the facts A. B. should have a pension or not. He submitted with all the seriousness and gravity which so big an issue demanded that a party official, temporarily at the head of a great public office, ought not to have the ultimate distribution among individuals of a sum of £7,000,000 or probably something like £9,000,000 or £10,000,000 a year. For the sake of the success of the Bill, for the sake of guarding the Government of the day against undue pressure in particular cases, and for the sake of guarding it against suspicion of acting unfairly and from improper motives, it was most important that this very delicate and semi-judicial task should be discharged by some independent and non-party authority. He would be quite content if they could find some official acting under the nominal authority of the Local Government Board as independent of any control by any executive office, as, for instance, the Registrar of Friendly Societies was in his semi-judicial functions. It would not redound to the success of the Bill, or to the satisfaction, contentment, and respect of the persons concerned, or to the safe conduct of proceedings in the House, if the President of the Local Government Board was made personally responsible for each individual decision and liable to be called in question by any Member or section of Members over his decision in any individual case. Of course, in Clause 11, in the case of Ireland and Scotland the Chief Secretary and the Secretary for Scotland were respectively named, and his remarks, therefore, equally applied to them. He was not speaking in any spirit of unfriendliness to the Bill, but with a desire to preserve the holders of these offices from a very invidious duty which he thought it would be most difficult for them to discharge, and the House from being in each individual case the Court of Appeal against the decision of the Local Government Board. The House must retain its right to vary the conditions under which pensions were given, and to make general rules; but nobody would contend that the House sitting in Committee of Supply on the Vote for the salary of the Secretary for Scotland, or of the Chief Secretary, or of the President of the Local Government Board, was capable of judicially determining whether a particular claim was really fair. He therefore strongly urged that they should have a really independent officer to decide individual cases, leaving the Local Government Board to lay down general regulations. He appealed to the Government to adopt that solution. He begged that they would at any rate tell them before they proceeded to a division, quite clearly and specifically, what was their intention in the matter. Did they mean each individual case to be subject to the review of the President of the Local Government Board, and the action of the President of the Local Government Board to be subject to the review of the House in each individual case, or did they not?

MR. MASTERMAN said that he was unable to give an outline of the machinery through which this pension authority would act, but no one would imagine that the President of the Local Government Board personally could review every one of many thousands of cases. Some officers would be chosen to deal specifically with the work of these appeals, but ultimately the responsibility of the Local Government Board must be recognised.

LORD R. CECIL said that the Committee were still in the dark as to what the Government really intended. Was it to be an administrative or a judicial appeal? If it was to be a judicial appeal, it was true they ran the risk of establishing a bureaucracy and removing the matter entirely from the control of Parliament. It was desirable, in his judgment, that the decision of these individual cases should be removed from the control of Parliament, for the House was incapable of formulating a judicial decision in any form. If the idea was to establish an administrative appeal it would still have to come before the House, and that, in his opinion, was the worst possible solution that could be desired. He still thought the practical control of the pension would be in the hands, not of the local committee, but of the Excise officer himself. He would be supreme. They were going to put into the hands of thousands of officers this power, knowing perfectly well that the action of subordinate local officials was one of the great difficulties of country life. Every one who lived in the country knew the kind of charges of corruption that were made against smaller officials in the country, and here they were going to put into the hands of men of very much the same position this enormous patronage, this enormous temptation to corruption, without any real supervision. In his opinion, the Committee was acting very unwisely in entrusting to these men this vast patronage and putting them in a dangerous and, he feared, fatal position of temptation.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 343; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 156.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix (Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery, Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.

Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James (Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph S.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David

Lough,Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal,E.
McCallum, John M.
McCrae, George
McKillop, W.
McLaren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
McMicking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Patrick A.(Queen's Co.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt Hn A.C.(Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central

Price, Robert John (Norfolk,E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William Clare
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampt'n
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmann'n
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.

Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHonSir Alex.F
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stuart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn. J.A.(Worc
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craig,Captain James-Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt.Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckh'm
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
McArthur, Charles
McCalmont, Colonel James
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike-Darlington
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorge D.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Hunt.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 17th June, successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, and on any Questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded this day.

Question put, "That Clauses 8 and 9 stand part of the Bill."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: On the point of order, are we not entitled to vote separately on Clauses 8 and 9?

*THE CHAIRMAN: No, the instruction under which I am putting this Question is—

"In the case of a series of clauses to which no notice of Amendment has been given by the Government, the Chairman shall put the Question that those clauses stand part of the Bill without putting the Question separately as respects each clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 330; Noes, 127. (Division List No. 157.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwod, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil G. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N, E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Edison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, B. H.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
McCallum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
McMicking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. S. E.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)

Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt Hn A.C.(Kincard.
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk,E.
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthuer James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmann'n
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease, and the Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn SirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn J.A.(Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Cooper, G. J.
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S)
Craig,Captain James(Down.E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gardner, Ernest
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hope,James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland

Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jowett, F. W.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, James (Halifax)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renton, Leslie
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Shackleton, David James
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Clause 10:

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 31, after the word 'Board,' to insert the words 'and with the Postmaster-General (so far as relates to the Post Office).'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 363; Noes, 101. (Division List No. 158.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. D.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. T. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Higham, John Sharpe
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk Bg'hs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montague, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray, Capt Hn A.C. (Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Peason, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E

Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)]
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry(Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates,Major E.F.(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants,W.)
Fell, Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
McArthur, Charles
McCalmont, Colonel James
Magnus Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Ratcliffe, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Fredrick Peel
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sheffield,Sir Berkeley GeorgeD.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent,Mid)
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C.B. Stuart-
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Question put, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 360 Noes, 99. (Division List No. 159.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone,N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil

Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)

Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James Harrow
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George

Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
McCrae, George
McKillop, W.
McLaren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
McLaren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
McMicking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray, Capt. Hn A. C. (Kincard
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip

O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, H.W.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Wateford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L..
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Snowden, J.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt.Hn.E.(Clackmann'n
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm'gham)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
McArthur, Charles
McCalmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Clause 11:

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 30, to leave out the word 'municipal.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 358; Noes, 90. (Division List No. 160.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r
Harmsworth, R L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)

Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold(Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Patrick A.(Queen's Co.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Alport

Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt.HnA.C. (Kincard.
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman

Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. McKinnon
Younger, George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Banbury Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm'gham)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
McArthur, Charles
McCalmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham.
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Pee
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. George D. Faber and Sir William Bull.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): On a point of order, is it not contrary to all rules of the House that a teller should receive the bows of all Members in passing without removing his own hat?

*__MR. CHAIRMAN__: I daresay in future the tellers will take the hint.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 41, to add at the end the words '(3) In the application of this Act to the Isles of Scilly, those isles shall be deemed to be a county and the council of those isles the council of a county."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 12 agreed to.

New Schedule :

Means of Pensioner.	Rate of Pension.
	s. d.
Where the yearly means of the pensioner as calculated under this Act—	
Do not exceed £21 - - - - - - - -	5 0
Exceed £21, but do not exceed £23 12s. 6d. - -	4 0
Exceed £23 12s. 6d., but do not exceed £26 5s. - -	3 0
Exceed £26 5s., but do not exceed £28 17s. 6d. - -	2 0
Exceed £28 17s. 6d., but do not exceed £31 10s. - -	1 0
Exceed £31 10s. - - - - - - - - -	No pension.

—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Schedule be added to the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 328 ; Noes, 51. (Division List No. 161.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashley, W. W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clive, Percy Archer
Clough, William
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Duckworth, James
Du Cros, Arthur Philip
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kekewich, Sir George
Keswick, William
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M‘Arthur, Charles
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Killop, W.
M‘Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M‘Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A. (Queen's Co
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Muldoon, John
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray,Capt.Hn A C.(Kincard)
Murray, James (Aberdeen, E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nicholson,Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttal, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Shee, James John
Parkes, Ebenezer
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, Robert John (Norfolk,E)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)

Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Leslie
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheffield,Sir Berkeley GeorgeD.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanier, Beville
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thomson,W.Mitchell (Lanark)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Younger, George
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Bowerman, C. W.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cooper, G. J.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hall, Frederick
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jowett, F. W.
Kelley, George D.
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, James (Halifax)
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Shackleton, David James
Snowden, P.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W, C.
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Walsh, Stephen
Wardle, George J.
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John, (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. George Roberts and Mr. Charles Duncan.

Bill reported, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 290.]

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at ten minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 2nd July, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Crystal Palace Company Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Swansea Valley Gas Bill [H.L.]; now Tawe Valley Gas Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee without amendment, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

Doncaster Corporation Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3ª on Monday next.

Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1.) [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3. Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Tramways Order Confirmation (No. 2.) Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]. Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3ª on Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations for the training of teachers for elementary schools. (In force from 1st August, 1908).

Code of regulations for public elementary schools in Wales (including Monmouthshire) with schedules, 1908.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

ARMY.

Regulations for the Territorial Force and the County Associations.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION ACT, 1906.

Rules made by the Board of Trade. Dated 1st of June 1908; dated 19th of June 1908.

PUBLIC RECORDS (TREASURY) (AFRICAN COMPANIES).

Schedule containing a list and particulars of classes of documents among the records of the Royal African Company and the company of merchants trading to Africa, which have been removed from the office of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury and deposited in the Public Record Office, but are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation therein.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Amendments reported (according to order).

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, the first Amendment standing in my name is to insert the word "yearly." That is a purely drafting Amendment. There are two similar Amendments following which are also of a purely drafting character.

Amendment moved—

"In page 2, line 18, after the word 'of,' to insert the word 'yearly.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 4, after the word 'separate,' to insert the word 'yearly.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 11, after the word 'the,' to insert the word 'yearly.'"—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, my next Amendment is in Clause 4, page 3, line 26, to leave out from the word "say" to the words "Valuation Acts" on page 4, line 5, and to insert a long Amendment which I shall ask your Lordships to allow me to explain. The Amendment itself is an important one, and is intended to deal with the case of the man who unreasonably withholds land from building in, or in the neighbourhood of, a town.

I must be allowed to remind your Lordships of what occurred on May 14th, when we were in Committee. On that occasion my noble friend Lord Balfour of Burleigh had moved certain words which I proposed to omit, and your Lordships finally agreed to omit those words. It was pointed out that the result of that might be to leave entirely undealt with the case of the man who unreasonably withholds land from building. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack appealed to this side of the House. He stated that that was the result, in his opinion, of what we had done, and he said himself that he thought it was a very difficult case to deal with in view of the action the Committee had taken, and that he was not willing to attempt to find the words himself, because the Bill in its new shape, annual value having been substituted for capital value, was not such as he personally approved. It was replied from this side of the House that we did not wish in any way to support the man who could be proved to be unreasonably withholding from building land which actually at the moment was suited and required for building; and the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, as well as others on this side of the House, said that if words could be devised they would be quite willing to give them their favourable consideration.

Since then this matter has been taken into serious consideration, and the result is the Amendment which I have now placed on the Paper. With regard to the first of the Amendments, your Lordships will observe that I have struck out the whole of the present definition and inserted a new definition. The new definition includes a good deal—in fact, in substance nearly all—of the Amendment of which it proposes to take the place, and I put it in that form for the purpose of making the Amendment more simple and more clear to the House, so that everyone could understand it merely by reading it. I thought that was preferable to putting down a series of small Amendments proposing to leave in certain parts and to leave out certain others. I propose to read my Amendment to your Lordships, and to comment briefly on the important words as I pass. I move to insert the words—

"'Yearly land value' means such part of the yearly rent or value of any lands or heritages as is fairly attributable to the land alone, (1) divested of buildings, erections, or improvements of whatever nature on, in, or under the soil, woods, fixed or attached machinery, and work of drainage and of reclamation, making up, levelling, and the like, where the benefit thereof is unexhausted at the time of valuation."

That was in the original Bill, and subsection (1) stands as it was. Then follows—

"(2) Subject to all building restrictions, servitudes, and contracts imposed thereon or existing in relation thereto."

The words "subject to all building restrictions and servitudes," were inserted by your Lordships in Committee, and the additional words "and contracts imposed thereon or existing in relation thereto," I have been advised are necessary to be inserted. Now comes the important proviso—

"Provided that in the case of land proved to be required in the public interest at the time of valuation for building or industrial purposes, and to be unreasonably withheld from use for such purposes, the yearly land value shall be estimated as if such land were in use for the purposes aforesaid."

Your Lordships will observe that that goes a very long way—in fact, I do not know how it could well go further—in the direction of enabling land to be assessed, or, at all events, to be valued, which is being withheld unreasonably. The main difference, I think, is in the word "proved." We held—and, if my memory serves me rightly, the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack agreed—that in these cases where it was proposed to assess a man on more than he received the onus of proof should lie on the assessor and not on the man whose property was going to be valued.

The next word is "required." It is not sufficient that the land should be suitable. Acting on the principle which this House asserted in the earlier stages of the Bill, it is provided that the land must not only be suitable but must be required, and must be required at the moment of valuation. It is not enough to say, as the noble and learned Lord's Bill proposed, that we are simply to take the purchase value because the purchase value embraces everything, prospective as well as present. What we say is that it must be actually required at the time of valuation for building or industrial purposes, and it must be required in the public interest. By that I do not mean for public buildings, but that it is in the public interest that there should be buildings upon that land and in that particular district; and also it must be proved that the land is unreasonably witheld from us for such purposes. Surely before land is valued on this excessively high valuation it is right that the owner should be proved to be witholding it unreasonably, whether the question be one of price or anything else. The question as to what is unreasonable will, of course, rest in the hands of the ultimate Appeal Court, and it seems to me that that Amendment, as I have described it to your Lordships, goes a great length in the direction of redressing the grievance which is said to exist. I say "said to exist" because your Lordships will recollect that we on this side of the House do not believe that there were many of these people. What we say is that, if it can be proved that there are such, we have no desire to shield or shelter them; and it is for that reason, and for that reason alone, that we are willing to go beyond the rent actually being received at the moment. That, as I say, is the most important part of the Amendment, and it is to that proposal that your Lordships will, I presume, mainly direct your attention.

Now follow certain exceptions. These are necessary, because if you do not have any exceptions whatever from this rule it might be made imperative upon a man to build over every bit of land he possesses in the neighbourhood of a town. Take, for instance, the case of a villa which has an eighth of an acre round it. If there is a heavy assessment on site value the result will be to promote what everyone is agreed ought to be prevented as far as possible—namely, congestion. The exceptions, four in number, are—

> "Land shall not be deemed to be unreasonably withheld from use—
>
> "(1) which is maintained as an open space or recreation ground."

I do not think any objection will be taken to that. It was recognised in the Scottish Bill, and I do not think it is necessary to trouble your Lordships in regard to it.

> "(2) Which is required for the amenity or convenience of a dwelling-house."

Those words, too, are to be found in the Scottish Land Bill of the present year, and they embrace such cases as I mentioned a moment ago of villas and other houses which have round them a quantity of land necessary for their amenity or convenience. It is a point which has been generally recognised in Scottish legislation.

> "(3) Which is required for the preservation of any buildings of historic or architectural interest."

I do not think it is necessary that I should trouble your Lordships on that point. The fourth exception is rather an important one—

> "(4) The maintenance of which in its existing condition is for the general advantage of the community."

That speaks for itself, and I do not think it is necessary that I should enlarge upon it. Then follows a proviso which appeared in the Bill when it was originally introduced and which we accepted in Committee—

> "Provided further that where the assessor considers that any restriction, servitude, or contract"—

the word "contract," of course, is new—

> "Created after the passing of this Act has been created in order to defeat this Act it shall be lawful for him (without prejudice to the appeal to which any person aggrieved is entitled) to disregard such restriction, servitude, or contract."

I think I have now fully explained the Amendment. The noble and learned Lord said he would give a very fair consideration to any words which met this difficulty. We do not deny that on paper, at all events, the difficulty exists, and we have done our best to meet it. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

Amendment moved—

"In page 3, line 26, to leave out from the word 'say' to the words 'Valuation Act' on page 4, line 5, and to insert the words 'yearly land value' means such part of the yearly rent or value of any lands or heritages as is fairly attributable to the land alone; (1) divested of buildings, erections, or improvements of whatever nature on, in, or under the soil, woods, fixed or attached machinery, and work of drainage and of reclamation, making up, levelling, and the like, where the benefit thereof is unexhausted at the time of valuation; and (2) subject to all building restrictions, servitudes, and contracts imposed thereon or existing in relation thereto. Provided that in the case of land proved to be required in the public interest at the time of valuation for building or industrial purposes, and to be unreasonably withheld from use for such purposes, the yearly land value shall be estimated as if such land were in use for the purposes aforesaid. Land shall not be deemed to be unreasonably withheld from use; (1) which is maintained as an open space or recreation ground; or (2) which is required for the amenity or convenience of a dwelling-house; or (3) which is required for the preservation of any buildings of historic or architectural interest; or (4) the maintenance of which in its existing condition is for the general advantage of the community. Provided further that where the assessor considers that any restriction, servitude, or contract created after the passing of this Act has been created in order to defeat this Act it shall be lawful for him (without prejudice to the appeal to which any person aggrieved is entitled) to disregard such restriction, servitude, or contract."—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I think it will be convenient for debate if I put the Question in the form "that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause," and then afterwards put the Question "that the other words be there inserted." As this is practically a Second Reading as well as a Committee stage, it might be convenient that we should debate the matter on both those Questions. I think I ought to take part at once in the discussion upon the very interesting proposal of the noble Earl. The Amendment only deals with one part of the subject of valuation, which of itself is a small part of the whole subject of rating—a subject that has been before your Lordships already.

Let me just say, before going straight to the Amendment now before the House, that I think the noble Earl has a little misapprehended what I think I have said. It is not mainly a question of the holding up of land that requires valuation. I think there ought also to be the means of putting a special rate upon any increased value by reason of public expenditure, and also, which practically is the same thing, any increased value hereafter accruing annually from the growth of a city or town in which the land is situated. I am not going to enlarge upon that subject, but I mention the point in order to guard against misapprehension. There is also, in my view, a necessity for rating appropriately and according to the value land which is not built upon at the present time or not used for industrial purposes at the present time, and that is the sole point with which the noble Earl's Amendment deals. I will, therefore, confine myself to that point in the observations I shall offer to the House.

I must do the Amendment the justice of saying that it has been carefully considered and is skilfully drawn, and when I read it first I came to regard some portions of it with great satisfaction. The Amendment assumes that it is possible—nay, that it ought to be done—to rate the site value apart from the composite value of site and buildings together. That is, indeed, satisfactory, because that is a point upon which there was considerable controversy when the Bill in its earlier stages was before the House. At all events, the noble Earl now agrees with us that that can be done. Secondly, the noble Earl proposes to apply the provision to land other than building land—to land used for industrial purposes also. The noble Earl speaks of land—

"divested of . . . . work of drainage and of reclamation, making up, levelling, and the like."

Accordingly, he contemplates the possibility of applying a site value to land which is not building land but which is reclaimed land for example. I am very glad indeed to draw that inference from the Amendment.

In addition the Amendment proposes, and I think most justly, that restrictions on the use of land created after the passing of the Act shall be disregarded. That is a point as to which some objection has been taken, but the noble Earl, very wisely if I may be allowed to say so, admits that in the proviso at the end of his Amendment. Finally, my Lords, I notice with great pleasure that the Amendment provides that the yearly land value is to be estimated as if the land were in use for building or industrial purposes. That is a hypothetical valuation, and I am very glad it should be recognised that that is practicable; also, I am glad that it should be recognised that the proper valuation should be, not as it is, but as it would be, if it were put to a beneficial use of that kind, subject, I know, to limitations. Now those points do, I think, constitute a step forward towards agreement, if agreement be ultimately obtained, upon this subject. Unless certain principles are admitted agreement is impossible, and the noble Earl has made a considerable advance in regard to those four points.

But there are objections to this Bill, upon one of which I need not dwell for I did so at length on the last occasion. I refer to annual value. We fought that battle out, and the majority of your Lordships were hostile to the view of capital value. We remain of the same opinion as to capital value; but I will not go into that discussion again as the House is not likely to change its opinion. But that is, of itself, an objection which goes to the very root and foundation of the Amendment, and constitutes an insuperable difficulty in the way of His Majesty's Government agreeing to this clause. There is one other, it seems to me, fatal blot in the Amendment. The noble Earl proposes that there shall be a valuation only in the case of land—

> "Proved to be required in the public interest at the time of valuation for building or industrial purposes, and to be unreasonably withheld from use for such purposes."

That is diametrically opposed to the view which His Majesty's Government entertain in regard to vacant land. I do not think I have ever said anything about land unreasonably withheld, nor am I quite sure how you could determine this. The point I have endeavoured to put before the House is that there ought to be fair play between ratepayers within each rating area. If one man has built a house upon his land worth so much a year and the other man has not built a house, and for that reason receives only a nominal rent for his land, as between ratepayer and ratepayer, one of them has a value of £1,000, and the other a value of £1,500; yet one pays on £50 a year and the other on £3 a year. I ask your Lordships whether that is fair as between one ratepayer and another.

There is no complaint made in the sense of accusing a man of any criminal or immoral conduct in not building upon his land. That is not the ground on which this Valuation Bill proceeds, nor the ground on which ultimate rating is contemplated. The point is that these two people possess property of a certain value, and one is rated in reference to the real value of his property and the other is not. The reason that happens is that the basis of rating at the present time is what a property would let for, year by year, to a tenant. Of course, property which is not built upon and is let year by year to a tenant in a town will only bring its agricultural value, and it is because the annual use governs the value that the owner is not rated as he ought to be. The basis of our proposals, the whole pith of our contention, is that people should be rated in proportion to the value of the property they possess. That is entirely disregarded in this Amendment; there is to be valuation of land as if it were in use for building, that is to say, not agricultural value, but only where it is proved to be required for building and to be unreasonably withheld. That is penalising a man for doing what he thinks right in regard to his own property. A man of business might say he would reserve his land for probably five or six years, when its value would be increased, but it would be a strange thing to say that the value for rating purposes should depend upon whether he had acted in a manner the assessors considered reasonable. I venture to think that a more dangerous principle than that of taxing a man according to his conduct, for that is what it is, could hardly be imagined; and I do not suppose for a moment that the noble Earl intends any great development to be given to the doctrine of which the germ lurks in this Amendment.

The real point to be faced is this. Is the House prepared to treat this as a question of the value of property? The question as to what rate you are going to put on, and whether you are going to put the rate on the full rateable value does not enter into this Bill. The exemption of parks and gardens and amenities does not arise under the Bill. The question is whether the House will enable a valuation to be so ascertained that men can be taxed according to the real value of their property. It has nothing to do with whether they have acted reasonably or unreasonably. I might offer other criticisms upon the Amendment, but they would be minor criticisms. I say, in the first place, that the Government feel an insuperable objection to the substitution of yearly land value for capital value; and, secondly, our opinion is that people ought to be rated according to their property and not according to their conduct.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I should like to say a few words in regard to the comments that we have just heard from the noble and learned Lord. I was pleased to hear even the modified approval of some parts of the Amendment to which the noble and learned Lord gave expression. In my opinion, the noble Earl who has moved this Amendment took a wise and convenient course in putting down his Amendment as a whole, instead of a great number of small Amendments changing words here and there. In its present form the Amendment shows, in a connected whole, the real intention of my noble friend. If I may say so, I think the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack failed to realise, or to let the House see that he realised, that a great deal of the phraseology of the Amendment is actually a quotation from the Bill. The noble and learned Lord commented, for example, upon the subsection which speaks of a site value "divested of buildings, erections, or improvements," and so on. The whole of that subsection is taken from the Bill as it stands.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: I expressed my gratification at the acceptance of it. What I meant to do was to signify how pleased I was that we were agreed upon these things.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I am afraid that comment is not quite right, because this subsection was not in the Bill as the Government draughtsman produced it to the other House of Parliament. The subsection was evolved about 4 o'clock in the morning in discussion in Committee between the two sides of the House, and, as a matter of fact, I believe most of those words were suggested by the Leader of the Opposition in the other House and accepted by the Government. I hope it will be acknowledged that the particular definition of land value is not conceived by the brain of the noble Earl, but is actually taken from the Bill. I regard that point as one of extreme importance, because that subsection is very much more favourable to the owner of agricultural land than according to the form in which it was introduced; and I would point out that, although the noble Earl is altering some words in the clause, he is not proposing any alteration at all in that subsection.

The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack then said that the particular Amendment, however good it might be for a limited purpose, dealt with only one part of the larger question, and that so far as he and the Government were concerned they wanted, not only to deal with the question of the holding up of land, but to get back public expenditure, and to go dangerously near the acceptance of the doctrine of the taxation of the unearned increment. The noble and learned Lord shakes his head, but he certainly said that he wanted to get something back from the value which was got by the landlord owing to the growth of a city or town. That is the doctrine of the unearned increment and nothing else. If you are going to take parcels of land which have improved in value on account of the growth of a town, then you must also, I think, take some account of the parcels of land which have been diminished in value by the shifting of the population; in other words, if you are going to raise the question of taking some part of the unearned increment, you will certainly in fairness involve yourselves in the difficulty of having to judge when a man has made a bad investment from want of foresight and has lost his money. My position upon the point is that it is a mischievous thing to speculate in land near a city or town. I do not believe there is anything like so much profit made out of it as is commonly represented; but, if you are going to tax the unearned increment of land, why are you not to make a special tax or rate upon the unearned increment in respect of any other kind of property? That seems to me a perfectly inadmissible proposal, and, therefore I am not moved by the condemnation of the noble and learned Lord of this Amendment on the ground that it does not do anything to secure that object.

I turn to the question of public expenditure. That, so far as Scotland is concerned, falls entirely to the ground. I admit that in cases where leasehold is the predominant method of building, where it is not done by feu but by leasehold, and where, during the currency of the lease, an expenditure has been met out of the rates which are levied on the leaseholder, then under those circumstances there is a sort of case for taking back by means of a special rate upon property much improved by expenditure drawn from the leaseholder when it falls into the hands of the ground landlord. That, so far as Scotland is concerned, falls absolutely to the ground, because any rate for improvement upon suburban property falls not upon the occupier but upon the owner. I have examined the accounts of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other large cities, and in the division of urban rates between owner and occupier, rates for improvements which add to the value of the land supposed to be held up are levied on the owner and not on the occupier; therefore, there is no ground for the allegation that the owner who holds up his land for a certain time and then puts it out for building does make a profit by public expenditure.

In two portions of the noble and learned Lord's speech he shed a tear over the excision of capital value. I do not want to labour the point. I am quite certain, as the noble and learned Lord himself is, he will not convert this House to rating upon capital value; but I would remind him that last autumn the late Prime Minister did not put the same amount of stress upon the question of capital value. There was a discussion in the Press between the right hon. Gentleman and myself as to whether I had personally taken a wise and fair course in advising that the Bill should be rejected last year, and the point that he took was that I was committed in my Report to rating upon capital value. I pointed out the fact that that was not the case. There is not one word of suggestion or support of rating on capital value in any part of the Local Taxation Commission's Report. The late Prime Minister did not stop there, for he said—

> "Even if these proposals were all that you say of them, they would still remain matters for consideration in Committee."

And the matters to which he referred were the adoption of capital or real value instead of annual value as the basis of assessment.

The fact of the matter is that the real difficulty in which we are placed in regard to this Bill is that very different and diverse accounts of it have been given by members of the Government when they have been speaking outside Parliament. The noble and learned Lord says that it is fair to take into account the value of one man's property and that of another; and the instance he gave was just the instance which I humbly submit to the House is the one which shows the extreme inexpediency of rating upon a value which might be got if the land was put up for the purpose but which there is no intention of getting. The noble and learned Lord gave us the instance of one man having built over his land while the other had not; in the case of the acre of land not built over, the man would be rated at about £3; whereas the other person would be rated on the annual revenue he was obtaining. But if you carry that to its logical conclusion and rate every open space in or near a town or city at a figure which it might produce if put to other purposes, you will take the very worst possible step for encouraging the policy of maintainng open spaces. You will make it so tremendously expensive to do it as to put it absolutely beyond the reach of the average man, and instead of spreading buildings over a large area with open spaces, which is the wisest and most healthy policy, you will tend to the production of what are called "skyscrapers," to the piling of one storey on to another so as to save the rating upon the site value. That is perfectly obvious and cannot be denied.

The grievance that is pleaded from time to time by those who support the rating of land which, as they say, is unreasonably held up, is this—that people are waiting on for a value which at the present time it would not produce. If you carry the noble and learned Lord's policy to its logical conclusion it really means the rating of every piece of land which ten, fifty, sixty, or 100 years hence might be exposed for building purposes. I quite agree—I have said so before, and I say it now—that if there are places which are surrounded by buildings and which are being unreasonably held up, then it is quite fair to penalise the owner to the extent of rating him upon what he might get for it. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack may say that that is rating on account of conduct. I see another way of achieving the object; I cannot develop it now, nor would it be germane to this Bill; but it is impossible—at least it is most unfair—in my humble opinion to rate upon what the land might be supposed to fetch.

The noble and learned Lord said that there is nothing in this Bill as to the quantum of the rate, that it does not arise under this Bill, that nothing is said as to the means which are to be taken or the amount of the rate. That is where I complain of the position in which we are placed. Other Members of His Majesty's Government have said what they mean. They say that they are going to transfer, and that the object of this Bill is to transfer, the whole of the rates on to the land value. That has been said over and over again. I hold in my hand some twenty-four or twenty-five speeches of the Solicitor-General saying that very thing—that the object of this Bill is to transfer the whole of the rates on to the land value. Now it is not reasonable—I go so far as to say it is not fair—for one member of the Government to hold out those expectations to people in the country, and for the noble and learned Lord to say that that is not in the Bill and, therefore, we are not to consider it in dealing with this Bill. As prudent men we are obliged to consider the objects and motives and ideas which have been put before the people of this country as the policy of His Majesty's Government, and it is because of those speeches, because of that definite statement of policy, that we are as cautious as we are in accepting the principles which we think are aimed at.

The noble and learned Lord says you should rate each man according to the property he possesses. That is not the test for rating at the present time. It is the test for death duties; it is the test for anything that can be laid on the capital value of property all round; but the whole idea of the rating system from the time of Queen Elizabeth in England, and from a very few years later in Scotland, has been not the question of the value, but the question what it produces. You are rated upon what you put into your pocket from all rateable subjects. If you are going now to revert to rating on capital value on one class of property, and in the case of one owner of property alone, you are accentuating an injustice which has been a scandal for the last forty years. For when you relieved personal property, stock in trade, and so on, you did not give an adequate contribution to those who are over-burdened by the existing rates; and if you go back, in regard to this one class of property, and that class of property alone, to capital value, you are accentuating an injustice of which, I believe, all wise reformers of local taxation are desirous of getting rid.

I will say nothing now about the small Amendment which I propose to make to this Amendment, because owing to the form in which the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack has put the Amendment, that matter does not arise at this point. Although the Amendment may not go the whole length which the Government desire, it is really an honest and skilful attempt to get at the one grievance which has been most paraded about the country, and I hope the House will accept, on general lines, the Amendment as moved by the noble Earl.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I was glad to hear the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack commence his observations by a cordial acknowledgment that my noble friend below the gangway had made an honest attempt to deal with a problem which the noble and learned Lord himself has told us is an extremely difficult one. I can assure the House that my noble friend's Amendment does represent a sincere effort on his part, and on the part of those whom he has consulted, to deal with this question.

The noble and learned Lord complains of my noble friend's proposal because it deals merely with a part of the subject with which His Majesty's Government desire to deal in the Bill upon the Table of the House. We are quite alive to that fact. We have endeavoured to deal, not with the whole of the scheme of His Majesty's Government, but with one particular feature of that scheme upon which throughout our discussions noble Lords opposite have chiefly dwelt—a point on which it did seem to us that a hard case might arise for which it was desirable that some provision, at all events, should be made. I refer to the case of the site owner who, for mistaken reasons, chooses to withhold from building land clearly capable of being turned to that purpose at the moment. It was pointed out to us, again and again, that the site owner who so withheld his property committed a double injustice upon the community—in the first place, by retarding the development of the city in the neighbourhood of which the land was situated; and, in the next place, by escaping a part of the burden of local taxation which ought equitably to fall upon his shoulders.

That is the case with which my noble friend desires to deal, and we are certainly very reluctant to go a step further. We feel very strongly, indeed, that if we do go further, if we do admit that this Bill is to be framed not upon the basis of yearly value but upon the basis of capital value, we let in at once the whole principle of taxing people upon property from which they do not yet derive any advantage, and open the door for the commission of a very flagrant injustice. My noble friend who sat down a moment ago spoke of the danger of admitting speculative values. May I mention to your Lordships a case illustrating that danger, of which I became aware very lately? It arose in the outskirts of London. A new railway was being made, and it was anticipated that property in that particular region was likely to increase greatly in value and to be rapidly built over. The owner of a large estate in that neighoburhood sold fifty acres of this land at £1,000 an acre to a syndicate. That was, I believe, only a few years ago, and I am told that at this moment not one single acre of the fifty has yet been built over. That shows how completely the shrewdest judgments are liable to go astray in thus anticipating the course of events.

We have never believed that this withholding of building sites was taking place to any appreciable extent. It is so much against the interests of the site owner to withhold his land. He is so likely to outstay his market that we do not believe the thing takes place very frequently. But, assuming that it may take place, that there may be such cases—and remember that during these long discussions no leading case has yet been produced—we are willing to deal with the matter to the best of our ability. Now, are the precautions taken in my noble friend's Amendment exaggerated precautions? The noble and learned Lord pointed out that the Amendment leaves the grievance of the ratepayers unredressed. I am not quite sure that that is entirely the case. But, be that as it may, can we really say that the stipulations contained in my noble friend's clause are unreasonable from the point of view of the ratepayers?

May I endeavour to point out to the House the manner in which this clause will operate? In the first place, it will be necessary to show that the land is wanted, and that it would be contrary to the public interest that it should be withheld; and, in the next place, it will be necessary to prove that the owner is acting unreasonably or perversely in withholding it. I ask your Lordships to consider the definition given in the four subsections that follow of what constitutes unreasonableness. I think my noble friend is quite right in placing words in his clause showing, for the guidance of the Court, what is meant by unreasonableness, because I do not think it would be fair to the Court to leave it without guidance in a case of that kind. Land is not to be deemed to be unreasonably withheld from use it if is—

> "Maintained as an open space or recreation ground."

Do noble Lords opposite suggest for a moment that the site owner is unreasonable if he withholds land in order to provide a recreation ground or open space? I think it will be very difficult, considering the proclaimed views of His Majesty's Government, for them to maintain that the reservation of land for a purpose of that kind is unreasonable, or that the person who so reserves it deserves to be mulcted for his conduct. The next condition is that the owner shall not be mulcted if the site is—

> "Required for the amenity or convenience of a dwelling-house."

I daresay that many of your Lordships have had an opportunity of reading the Government's Town Planning Bill. The whole essence of that Bill is that an endeavour should be made not to crowd buildings upon a site but to distribute them reasonably and in a manner consistent with the health, comfort, and well-being of the people who live upon the site. Then I need not dwell upon the reasonableness of the owner who retains land—

> "For the preservation of any buildings of historic or architectural interest."

I think both political parties are deeply committed to the policy of doing nothing which shall diminish the beauty or prevent the public enjoyment of buildings of which it can be said that they are of historic or architectural interest. The last condition, which is a very widely-drawn one—

> "The maintenance of which in its existing condition is for the general advantage of the community—"

speaks, I think, for itself. You have only to turn it round. Are you prepared to say that you wish to impose a special rate upon the person who desires to keep his land in its existing condition for the general advantage of the community? I take it that that is a proposition which will not be challenged. I say, then, that these seem to me to be most reasonable stipulations, and those who sit round me will certainly support my noble friend in his endeavour to obtain the addition of these words to the Bill, believing that by thus amending it we have shown that, reluctant as we are to admit the principle of rating on prospective value, we are ready to admit it in this one case and under the very necessary precautions upon which my noble friend desires to insist.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I hope noble Lords from Scotland will forgive me when I say that the debate on this Amendment is more interesting than any Amendment could be which dealt merely with Scotland, because it is concerned with a very great principle which is applicable to the whole of the United Kingdom. The noble Marquess who has just sat down said that my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack had complained that the noble Earl's Amendment dealt only with half the question. My noble and learned friend did not complain, but he was bound to point out the fact, for this reason. It is obvious, of course, that we cannot oppose this Amendment, because it is an improvement, so far as it goes, on the Bill as it was left before by your Lordships; but it was necessary for my noble and learned friend, in consequence of that fact, to point out that we did not regard it as satisfying all the conditions which we desired to satisfy. It is perfectly true, as my noble and learned friend said, that this does only deal with half the question. It deals with the question to some extent as between the landowner on the one hand and the would-be occupier or land speculator, as the case may be, on the other; but it does not deal with the fair incidence of the rate as between ratepayer and ratepayer.

It is, I think, important to notice what exactly is supposed will happen under this suggestion of the noble Lord; and I should like to say, in passing, that I also entirely recognise that this is a most careful and honest effort on my noble friend's part to deal with this side of the question. It is stated that land which is unreasonably held up is to be rated. What exactly is "unreasonably held up"? Take the case of the two plots which have been so often mentioned—one built upon, and the other not. Somebody, I suppose, goes to the local authority and says that he would like to acquire this vacant plot for purposes of building; and, if the assessor is satisfied that he ought to have it, it is then to be rated as though it were built upon. But the owner may say, "This gentleman is not offering enough; he is not offering my price." Are you going to fix the price of land by the act of the assessor?

*THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: No, the Court.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: It seems to me that the result will be that the assessor will have to decide whether the price offered is a reasonable one, in which case it will be rated at the full building value; whereas, if he thinks it unreasonable, the land escapes rating except at its agricultural value. I wonder whether that is a result which has been altogether contemplated by noble Lords opposite?

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: It is intended to be decided by the Court of Appeal.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Price-fixing, even by the Court of Appeal, is surely rather a novel suggestion. The logical outcome, I think, of the noble Earl's proposal would be compulsory purchase, and that, I imagine, is a result from which noble Lords opposite would surely shrink. The noble Lord, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, returned to the charge about annual and capital value. I must say once more that, in my opinion, the difference is not between annual and capital value, but between actual value received and some hypothetical value. What is the process in this instance? The land is to be rated on the rental which it would fetch if it were covered with buildings. What is the difference between taking that imaginary rental and calling it annual value, or capitalising it and calling it capital value? I confess I cannot see what the difference is; but the noble Lord has, as my noble and leaned friend says, made a great advance by accepting the possibility of contingent or hypothetical value in certain cases, although, I admit, in only limited cases. The noble Lord, Lord Balfour, said that capital value was unknown in rating, though it was applied to death duties. It is not applied to death duties in these cases. The owner of this particular kind of land escapes also in the matter of death duties, because, unless I am greatly mistaken—I am speaking only from memory—death duty is only assessed on thirty years purchase, if that is the figure, of the actual rent received at the time.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: Land forming part of an agricultural estate cannot be assessed for death duties at more than twenty-five years of the assessment to income-tax, but that does not apply to building land or to land of the class we are talking of.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: But, as a matter of practice, where land forms part of the neighbourhood of a town it is not valued at more than its annual value. At least, that is my impression. The restrictions placed by the noble Earl on the operation of his clause do not, as my noble friend said, form a very material part of this Bill; they form more properly part of a Bill dealing with actual rating, but as the noble Marquess has alluded to them I will just say this. Proposition number two is one which, taken in a certain sense, would, I imagine, meet with general agreement; but, of course, the term "amenity" is a very large one. The term might possibly be taken to mean a view over an extensive prospect of country, and a good deal of land would thus escape which I think the noble Earl would hardly think ought to escape. Then with regard to the fourth exemption—

> "The maintenance of which in its existing condition is for the general advantage of the community."

As the noble Marquess pointed out, nobody would assent to the opposite proposition. On the other hand, I confess I do not know exactly what meaning is to be attached to the words. If the light and air argument were pressed to its utmost, it would be possible to say that it would be to the advantage of the whole of the existing community that no more land should be built upon. The terms, therefore, seem to me to be dangerously wide.

Lord Balfour used one argument which has become familiar to us in the course of this discussion. He said that land would be forced into the market, and that it would be to the interest of everybody to build sky-scrapers. Undoubtedly, if no restrictions were placed upon this power or upon the incidence of the rate it is perfectly true that there would be such a risk. But surely it does not pass the wit of man to discover a plan of the nature of that town-planning of which the noble Marquess spoke, by which allowance can be made in the matter of rating where land is laid out in the manner most suitable to the health of the people. I quite agree that it would be exceeding unfair if a man who placed only eight houses with gardens upon an acre was rated at the whole possible amount which the land might fetch if covered with one enormous sky-scraper. But surely it does not pass the possibilities of legislation to meet cases of that kind, and to rate in such a manner as will not be in any way contrary to the public interest. As I have said, we are not going to oppose the insertion of these words in place of those already in the Bill; but my noble and learned friend has thought it necessary to draw attention to the fact that the alteration does not turn the Bill into a form in which we can regard it as a satisfactory measure.

*Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY: My Lords, before the House disposes of this Amendment I wish to say one word of protest against the theory which seems to have been accepted both by Lord Balfour and by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. There was an apparent competition for the copyright in the words "divested of buildings, erections, or improvements," etc. I think it is quite clear that in the Bill as it was originally introduced the Government intended this limitation to go back only twenty years, but it was made perpetual as the result of pressure in the House of Commons.

I think it is extremely important, when we are dealing with economic matters like taxation, that we should not confuse them with ethical matters. Our business is to see what is the property which is fairly chargeable to the burden of taxation, and to put taxation fairly upon it. The community has nothing whatever to do with what was the aboriginal and ancient cause of the improved value, and I think there is something to be said for a limited period of exemption under this head. But there can be no use in having a column giving the value of the land as distinct from the buildings as a matter of mere idle statistics; it must be intended to lead up hereafter to some differentiation of taxation which will put some special part on that which is thought to be the result of no human effort of intelligence.

These ancient improvements which have developed the property have nothing to do, in a great many cases, with the present proprietors. The property has doubtless passed from hand to hand at the then value, and the purchasers have never anticipated that the Legislature would subsequently search into the original cause of the fertility and productiveness of the land. You may have a seaside resort with land possessing a considerable building value, but many of the original proprietors may have had to expend considerable sums of money in erecting walls to protect it, whilst other owners had their land so well situated as not to need this protection. That land may have passed from hand to hand, and to the person now possessing an eligible site it does not matter whether the original owner had to build sea-walls or not; and to rake back into ancient history to find out the various causes which have contributed to the present value of the land is, to my mind, perfectly absurd and unreasonable. The only question you have to deal with is the actual value.

In dealing with these complex rating questions, which will have to be taken in hand shortly, Parliament will find itself involved in immense difficulties if it attempts to trace back, possibly to the Dark Ages, the cause of the present value of land. Fancy such a thing being proposed in Holland. Who could go back to ascertain when the first dykes were made to keep out the North Sea? This proposal would act inequitably on property which has been in its present state for a long time, and which has passed from hand to hand at its then value without any reference to circumstances as to how it got that value.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," resolved in the negative.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, the Amendment now before the House is "That the proposed words be there inserted," and as the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack stated that these were to be regarded as two separate Amendments I will address to your Lordships one or two words with regard to what has passed. I quite admit that the words which I now propose to insert deal only with a very limited part of the Bill. They do not profess to deal with the question as a whole. The noble and learned Lord said that he regarded this as a Second Reading question, and he certainly did proceed to act upon that, because, if I may say so with all deference, a great proportion of his remarks were not addressed to my Amendment at all but to the general question as to whether annual value or capital value was the better system of rating.

The noble and learned Lord observed that he was glad to see that I accepted certain principles of prospective valuation. I wish to put in a *caveat* to that. I put down these words because I was dealing with what is said to be a very great grievance. I believe it is a grievance that exists much more on paper than in any other form, and even if this Amendment were to come into force I expect your Lordships would find that there would not be half so many proceedings under it as a great many people would lead us to believe. But I wish to say, once and for all, that I object altogether to the system of rating on capital value, because it includes prospective value. The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack told us in Committee that he did not propose to rate upon prospective value. He would, however, rate on the saleable value; and he cited a case of a person who would give £1,000 for a piece of land. But when that person gives £1,000 for that piece of land, does he not buy the future as well as the present? Is it conceivable that anybody could be so foolish as to give £1,000 for a thing which was fetching £2 an acre unless he had in his mind some idea that, either by laying out a great deal more money or something of that sort, he would make it worth much more hereafter. As a matter of fact, when a man buys land he buys it as a whole for all time; and I am utterly unable to understand the noble and learned Lord when he says that he proposes to rate on capital value and yet does not propose to include prospective value. I beg to move my Amendment down to the word "community." That will leave the proviso, to which Lord Balfour proposes to move an Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"To insert the words 'yearly land value' means such part of the yearly rent or value of any lands or heritages as is fairly attributable to the land alone, (1) divested of buildings, erections, or improvements of whatever nature on, in, or under the soil, woods fixed or attached machinery, and work of drainage and of reclamation, making up, levelling, and the like, where the benefit thereof is unexhausted at the time of valuation; and (2) subject to all building restrictions, servitudes, and contracts imposed thereon or existing in relation thereto: Provided that in the case of land proved to be required in the public interest at the time of valuation for building or industrial purposes, and to be unreasonably withheld from use for such purposes, the yearly land value shall be estimated as if such land were in use for the purposes aforesaid; Land shall not be deemed to be unreasonably withheld from use: (1) which is maintained as an open space or recreation ground or (2) which is required for the amenity or convenience of a dwelling-house; or (3) which is required for the preservation of any buildings of historic or architectural interest; or (4) the maintenance of which in its existing condition is for the general advantage of the community.'"—*(The Earl of Camperdown.)*

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I thought I had avoided the controversy as to prospective value, but as the noble Earl has referred to it, let me answer him. I think prospective value ought not to be taxed, but present value should be taxed. If a farm is worth £1,000 to-day and will sell in the market for that sum, that is its present value. One element may be that hereafter it will produce more, but what I mean by present value is what a man will give for it in the market.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"To insert the words 'Provided further that where the assessor considers that any restriction, servitude, or contract created after the passing of this Act has been created in order to defeat this Act it shall be lawful for him (without prejudice to the appeal to which any person aggrieved is entitled) to disregard such restriction, servitude, or contract.' "—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH, who had given notice to move to amend this Amendment by leaving out the words "the assessor considers" in line 1 of the proviso and inserting the words "it appears," said: My Lords, the proviso which I propose to amend is taken verbatim from the Bill as it stands, and as the noble Earl has omitted the whole of the clause from the Bill, I am obliged to put my Amendment down as an Amendment to his Amendment. The proposal in the proviso is perfectly right and I support it, but I do not think that if there is an appeal taken, it should be upon a point of whether the assessor "considers" a thing, but on a question whether it is the fact that it exists. I suggest that if you pass the proviso as it has been moved by my noble friend, the only question for the Court of Appeal would be what the assessor considers. The assessor might take all sorts of extraordinary views; for my part, I do not care a row of pins what the assessor considers; what I want to know is what is the fact. I think my words safer, and I ask the House to accept them.

Amendment moved to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the words 'the assessor considers' at the commencement of the proviso, and to insert the words 'it appears.' "—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: I have no objection at all to that Amendment.

On Question, Amendment to the proposed Amendment agreed to.

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: I now ask your Lordships to agree to a consequential Amendment to substitute the words "the assessor" for the word "him" in the proviso.

Amendment moved to the proposed Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'him,' and to insert the words 'the assessor.' "—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Consequential Amendment agreed to.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next, and to be printed as amended. [No. 121.]

COMMONS BILL [H.L.].

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of AGRICULTURE and FISHERIES (Earl Carrington): My Lords, the small Bill which I have the honour to ask your Lordships to read a second time to-day is brought forward in consequence of a promise which I gave to Lord Kenyon as far back as 1906, that I would take action to remedy a grievance which is felt principally on the commons of Wales. It is two years ago that my noble friend introduced a most influential deputation of gentlemen interested in the breeding of Welsh ponies, and they called my attention to the evil caused by immature or blemished stallions being allowed to run free on the hills and common lands of Wales. That grievance was also brought to our notice when the noble Lord and I served on the Welsh Land Commission some years ago, and it was then requested that something might be done. The object of the Bill is to give to persons entitled to turn out animals on commons power to make regulations determining the time at and conditions under which entire animals may be turned out. I do not think there is anything in the Bill that requires further explanation, except perhaps that I might mention that in the Bill the expression "animals" means horses, asses, cattle, sheep and swine. The Bill is entirely permissive. It has been well threshed out and talked over by noble Lords and others interested in the subject. I believe there is no objection to the Bill either from landowners, commoners, or farmers, and I therefore with confidence ask your Lordships to give it a Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª"—(*Earl Carrington.*)

LORD KENYON: My Lords, I should like to express gratitude to the noble Earl for having answered the appeal which the deputation made to him some two years ago. He has rather apologised for the length of time it has taken to frame this measure, but I am sure if he answers every deputation which I may have the honour to introduce to him with a Bill in two years I shall be very satisfied. I think there is great necessity for this Bill as the breed of ponies is rapidly deteriorating in North Wales and other parts which will be principally affected. A short while ago a certain society required a pony stallion and they searched nearly the whole of Wales without being able to obtain one. Within the last few months I have seen the procedure embodied in this Bill put in practice on a large common with very good effect.

VISCOUNT ST. ALDWYN: There is one point to which I should like to call attention. The Bill empowers certain persons to make regulations for determining the times at which and conditions under which entire animals should be turned out on a common. There may be a common—I know of one myself—upon which it would not be at all desirable that any entire animals should be turned out. Would the regulations as proposed in the Bill enable the turning out of entire animals to be forbidden in such a case as that, if the persons locally concerned wished it?

EARL CARRINGTON: I do not think there is any doubt on that subject whatever. I believe the Bill as it stands would be quite safe on that point, but I will look into it.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Monday next.

THE IRISH LAND ACT.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government if they will lay on the Table the evidence taken before the Departmental Committee of the Treasury on the Finance of the Land Act (Ireland) 1903.

LORD DENMAN: My Lords, this same Question was recently put in another place and answered there by the Prime Minister, and all I can do is to give a similar reply to that which Mr. Asquith gave in the House of Commons. He stated that it would not be to the public interest to publish the evidence which was given before the Departmental Committee, and he also added that a good deal of that evidence was confidential. That being the case, it would obviously be a breach of faith on the part of the Department concerned were they to publish the evidence given before the Committee. I should only like to add that we have no wish to keep back any information we are able to give as to the manner in which the Land Purchase Act has worked. That, I think, was clear from the reply furnished by the Irish Office the other day to Lord Donoughmore, and I think noble Lords from Ireland who are interested in this matter will concede that we have given all the information which, in the circumstances, it is possible to make public. As to the particular request of the noble Earl, I hope he will not press for the publication of this evidence.

THE EARL OF MAYO: I will, with the leave of the House, merely ask one question. The noble Lord stated that a good deal of the evidence was confidential. I believe it is the case that, with regard to some of the witnesses, the evidence was taken under agreement that it was to be confidential. But might we not have published such part of the evidence as was not confidential?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I have no doubt that my noble friend will look into that matter; but, speaking generally, I should have thought it very undesirable to publish only part of the evidence given before a Departmental Committee. I therefore hope the noble Lord will not press for it.

ASSIZES AND QUARTER SESSIONS BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to order): An Amendment (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at ten minutes past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 2nd July, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Bristol Tramways Bill [Lords]; Cambrian Railways Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed without Amendment.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill.—Order [17th February] that the Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill be committed, read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).

Mr. PARTINGTON reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills; "That, for the convenience of parties concerned, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock."

Report to lie upon the Table.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

Sir GEORGE WHITE reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills; That the parties promoting the Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill had stated that the evidence of Sydney Malkin, Mayor of Burslem, was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Sydney Malkin, Mayor of Burslem, do attend the said Committee to-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Ordered, That Sydney Malkin do attend the Committee on Group K. of Private Bills To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

Rochester Bridge Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

Holderness Water Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 4).

Mr. SOAMES reported from the Committee on Group 4 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from St. Helen's Pit, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Dearham; Flimby; Fordingbridge; Glasgow; Penywern; and Sheffield; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools in Wales (including Monmouthshire), with Schedules, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (CHANGES IN WAGES, ETC.).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th June; *Mr. Sydney Buxton*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 206.]

PENSIONS (CIVIL LIST).

Order [18th June] for a Return relative thereto, read, and discharged; and instead thereof:—

Return ordered, "of all persons now in receipt of Civil List Pensions charged on the Consolidated Fund, distinguishing the Pensions granted under the Civil List Act, 1837, and those granted under the Civil List Act, 1901."—(*Mr. Lamont.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Post Office Wages—Cost of Living at Dundee.

MR. WILKIE (Dundee): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that on page 33, Appendix (4), of the Appendices to the Minutes of Evidence, Select Committee on Post Office Servants, the index number of rent and prices combined is given by the Board of Trade as 115 at Dundee, 111 at Plymouth, and 111 at Devonport, and that, according to the latest Board of Trade Returns published during the current year, Dundee is the most costly provincial city in the United Kingdom, being only one point below London; and whether considering the elevation of Plymouth and Devonport to to the extent of 4s. weekly, by reason of the high cost of living, he will state the reason for no advance being made to the Dundee staff.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) In the first statement referred to by the hon. Member the rent and prices at Dundee have been compared with an average of 19 towns only, 16 in England and Wales, 2 in Scotland, and 1 in Ireland. In the second statement the comparison is with London. Neither of these comparisons takes into account the different conditions of housing in Scotland and England. The comparison of the Scottish standard based upon the average of the towns in Scotland inquired into by the Board of Trade gives Dundee the same index number of cost of living as Edinburgh, viz. 103. Dundee has about 1,100 units of work and falls properly for the scales of pay of the Post Office staff into Class 2, the range of which is from 800 to 1,700 units. The cost of living on the Scottish standard is not sufficiently high to warrant its promotion to Class 1, and it therefore remains in Class 2. Plymouth and Devonport combined have over 1,600 units of work, The amount of work is therefore very nearly sufficient to warrant Class 1 scales, even if the cost of living were not above the average. As the index number of the cost of living is as high as 112 Plymouth and Devonport fall into Class 1.

Post Office Mails—Payments to Railway Companies.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will state the amounts paid by the Post Office to the various railways in England, Ireland, and Scotland, respectively, for the carriage of mails, etc., in the year 1907; and the amounts paid by the various Government Departments in the three countries for the travelling expenses of officials.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) As regards the payment to the railway companies for the conveyance of the mails, I beg to refer the hon. Member to the details furnished on page 108 and 109 of the Revenue Department Estimates for the current year, which will, perhaps, suffice for his purpose. These figures do not include the payment for the parcel post, the total amount of which for the year 1907 was £1,014,215. This sum is distributed among the individual companies by the Railway Clearing House Committee, and I have no information as to the proportion received by the different companies. I regret that it is not possible without considerable labour to ascertain the amounts paid to the railway companies for the travelling expenses of Post Office officials, and I have of course no information in regard to the expenditure of other departments of the public service.

Motor Cabs in London.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what is the number of motor cabs licensed for hire in London; what is the number of cabs and hansom cabs, as distinguished from motor cabs, licensed for hire in London; what number of applications for motor cab licences are now awaiting settlement; what is the number of motor omnibuses licensed for hire in London;

and what is the number of horse omnibuses licensed for hire in London.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) 1,508 motor cabs are licensed for hire in London; 5,329 hansom cabs and 3,768 horsed four-wheel cabs are similarly licensed. The number of motor omnibuses is 1,046 and of horsed omnibuses is 2,281. So far as is known there are no applications for motor-cab licences awaiting settlement.

Revenue Statistics.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state what percentage proportions of revenue derived from direct and indirect taxes, respectively, bear to the total revenues of Ireland and Great Britain taken separately from the latest available figures subsequent to the financial year 1903–4, omitting the figures for the amount contributed per head.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The proportions of the total tax revenue derived from direct and indirect taxes respectively in the last four years have been as follows—

	Great Britain.		Ireland.	
	Direct.	Indirect.	Direct.	Indirect.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
1904–5 - - - -	50·8	49·2	27·4	72·6
1905–6 - - - -	51·7	48·3	26·7	73·3
1906–7 - - - -	52·8	47·2	27·9	72·1
1907–8 - - - -	52·4	47·6	27·8	72·2

Guaranteed Loans to the Colonies.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will grant a Return showing the loans guaranteed and grants made by the Imperial Government to the British Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The noble Lord will find the information for which he asks, as regards guaranteed loans in the annual Finance Accounts, which are presented to Parliament, and as regards grants in the Estimates. I hardly think it is necessary in the circumstances to incur the expense, which is considerable, of a Return.

Kilbrin Land Purchase Dispute.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are aware, in regard to the sale of the estate of C. H. B. Good and another, Kilbrin, County Cork, purchased by the tenants at twenty-three and a half years purchase on rents graded to second term, that the landlords' solicitor made a mistake, in calculating the purchase interest of Mr. John Nash, Corbally, in not making allowance for the proportionate share of a half-acre cottage plot, with the result that Mr. Nash is overcharged on the payment of the purchase interest; and whether the Commissioners will make the necessary deductions of the amount overpaid before the payment of the next half-year's interest falls due.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the holding of John Nash was vested in him on 30th Janurary last. It comprised 223 acres, and the purchase money was £2,295, being 18·7 years purchase of the judicial rent of £122 7s. It appears from the documents lodged in this case that the labourer's plot referred to was not included in the holding purchased by Mr. Nash. The Commissioners have no knowledge as to the manner in which the terms of purchase were arrived at in this particular case, but, in any event, as the holding has been duly vested in the tenant in accordance with the terms of the agreement for purchase signed by him, the Commissioners cannot act in the manner suggested in the Question.

East Clonfert Evicted Tenant.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners received an application from Mrs. Julia Guiney, of Ballingarry, County Limerick, for untenanted land in lieu of the farm situate at Glenakill South, Clonfert East, in the County Cork, from which she was evicted on the expiration of the lease in the year 1881, by the landlord, Mr. James Deane, of Monkstown, County Cork; whether they also received an affidavit of Mrs. Guiney, setting out the facts of her eviction, in support of her claim; and, if so, considering that she was evicted from the land, and that her son-in-law, with whom she lives, is a young man with a large family who is fully qualified to farm land, will they give her a parcel of untenanted land in the county to which, under the Land Act of 1903 she would be entitled.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have considered Mrs. Guiney's application, and have decided to take no action either for her reinstatement or in order to provide her with a new holding. The farm which was occupied by the applicant's late husband was sublet at the date of eviction, and for sixty years previously. The case, therefore, is not one to which the Land Law Acts apply, and, consequently, the applicant is not eligible for reinstatement.

Maghera Constables.

Mr. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, as the result of investigation, all the constables stationed in Maghera are to be transferred, with one exception; whether he can state how many constables have been transferred from Maghera since Sergeant Gallagher took charge of this station; whether it was decided, as the result of an investigation held at Portstewart, when Sergeant Gallagher was there, that he was never to be allowed to reside in a station again; whether any outside pressure was brought to bear on the county-inspector to retain Gallagher in Maghera, and, if so, by whom; whether wherever Gallagher has been stationed investigations have been the order of the day; and whether, in the interests of all concerned, he will consider the advisability of compulsorily retiring Gallagher from active service.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The police authorities inform me that one constable has recently been transferred from Maghera, and there is no present intention of transferring others. During the past two and three-quarter years four others have been transferred, namely, one on reduction of the strength of the station, one to fill a vacancy on the reserve, and two in connection with disciplinary matters. There is no record of any decision that Sergeant Gallagher was not to reside in a station. No pressure has been brought to bear on the county inspector to retain Sergeant Gallagher at Maghera. The sergeant was selected for that station as being a steady and trustworthy man, and there is no reason why he should be compulsorily retired.

Belfast Police and Licence Holders.

Mr. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that members of the police force in Belfast have been on duty outside well-conducted licensed premises in that city for some weeks past, keeping customers under observation and seriously interfering with the owners in the conduct of their legitimate trade; whether any explanation is forthcoming as to the reason for this surveillance; whether it involves any extra expenditure; and, if so, by whom will the expenditure be borne; and whether he will give instructions for the discontinuance of the practice.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Government directed the police authorities to collect information as to the number of women and children frequenting public-houses in the six county boroughs of Ireland during the fortnight ending 26th June. In collecting this information the duty referred to in the Question was performed, and the police authorities are satisfied that there was no interference with the legitimate trade of the publicans whose houses were under observation. No extra expenditure was incurred. The duty terminated on 26th June.

Admissions to Belfast Workhouse.

Mr. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Report of the admission committee of the Belfast board of guardians, to the effect that the number of provisional admissions to the workhouse which were confirmed amounted during the week ending 23rd June to 450, and the number of applicants admitted to thirty; whether the number of admissions has been largely increasing of late; whether a considerable proportion of the admissions are of able-bodied men; whether the increase is largely due to the depression in the linen trade in Belfast, or, if not, whether any other cause can be assigned for it; and whether the Local Government Board propose to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board are informed that the figures quoted in the Question are correct, but that, compared with the immediately preceding weeks, the number admitted was not exceptional. The total number of inmates is fifty-seven less than in the previous week and 322 less than in January, but is 500 higher than in the corresponding week of last year. It is not the case that a large proportion of the persons recently admitted are able-bodied men. The Local Government Board understand that the industrial depression which was referred to in my Answer to the hon. Member's Question of 25th May still continues, and in that Answer I indicated the measures which should be taken by the guardians for the relief of any exceptional distress which may arise.

Araglin Evicted Tenants.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether the Estates Commissioners have made inquiry through one of their inspectors into the cases of two evicted tenants named O'Shea and Kelleher, on the Buckley estate, Araglin County Cork; whether Colbert, the present occupier of the farms, would be willing to give them up to the evicted tenants on receiving compensation; and if the Commissioners will endeavour to effect the reinstatement of Messrs. O'Shea and Kelleher in their old holdings.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have inquired into the applications of Denis Kelleher and Mrs. Ellen O'Shea, and have decided to take no action in Mrs. O'Shea's case, but will provide Denis Kelleher with a farm in the event of their acquiring untenanted land in the district.

Teenan's Estate, Donegal.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the holding on Teenan's estate, County Donegal, of which Patrick Fox, Ardfinnan, near Bundoran, was tenant, and whose late tenant surrendered the holding to the Commissioners with a view to the reinstatement of the original tenant, has been included in the purchase scheme of the Teenan's estate; and, if not, will steps be promptly taken to secure the inclusion of this holding in the purchase scheme of this estate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell*). The holding in question is included in the estate proposed to be sold to the tenants the present occupier, William Rogers, having signed an agreement for its purchase. The Commissioners understand that Rogers is prepared to surrender the farm to Fox on receiving compensation, and the question of compensation is at present under the Commisioners' consideration.

Irish Fee Fund Surplus.

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the present amount of the surplus of the fee fund mentioned in subsection 2 of

Section 122 of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898; and what did such surplus amount to in the past three financial years.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) On 25th March, 1906, the fee fund in question amounted to £15,300, invested in 2½ per cent. Consols, and the balance in the bank was £204 18s. 11d. On the corresponding date in 1907 and 1908, the balance in the bank was £577 0s. 7d. and £949 2s. 3d., respectively, the amount invested remaining as before. On 28th May last a further sum of £1,000 was invested in Consols, making the amount at present invested £16,300.

Dog Licences and Vivisection.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state what is the number of dog licences paid for on behalf of each of the following authorities during the year 1907, viz., Joyce Green Hospital, Dartford, Kent; Pontsfall's Farm, Newgate Street, Hatfield, Herts; Brown Institution, Wandsworth Road, London; Conjoint Laboratory of the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, Examination Hall, Victoria Embankment, London; Guy's Hospital Medical School, London; London Hospital Medical College, London; London School of Tropical Medicine; Royal Veterinary College, Camden Town, London; University College, Medical and Scientific Departments, London; Wellcome Physiological Research Laboratories, Herne Hill; and whether any special inquiries were made at places licensed for vivisection as to the precise number of dogs which they keep, and if this number corresponds with the number of licences issued in respect to each such institution.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) No separate record is kept of licences taken out for institutions licensed for vivisection but if my hon. friend desires it I could ascertain from the Inland Revenue authorities in the different districts the number of licences taken out for each of the institutions named; but some time must elapse before I could procure the information.

Welsh Postal Pay.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the new scales of pay and units of work for the Post Offices at Welshpool, Newton, Montgomery, Llanfyllin, Llanidloes, and Machynlleth have yet been settled.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I hope to be able to make a further announcement on the subject of classification very soon.

Unused Reply-Paid Telegrams.

MR. COWAN (Surrey, Guildford): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the regulation under which the Post Office retains all moneys paid in respect of unused reply-paid telegram forms when application for the return of such amounts is not made by the sender within two months of the date of issue of such forms; whether he can state how many of these forms have been cancelled, and what is the amount of private property which has been confiscated under this regulation since it came into operation; and whether he will consider the Amendment of the regulation with a view to enabling the public to receive value for, or to recover at any time, moneys paid to the Post Office in respect of services which it at present refuses, after an arbitrarily fixed date, to render.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) My attention has been called to the regulation to which the hon. Member refers, and the question of amending it with the object suggested has been frequently considered. It has not, however, been found possible to devise a system which would place a check upon fraud without at the same time involving expenditure out of proportion to the inconvenience which it is desired to remove. But I am making further inquiry into the question. I have at present no information as to the number of reply-paid forms which have remained unused, and of which the value has not been recovered within the prescribed period.

Education Waivers.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the President of the Board of Education in how many cases during the school year 1907–8 applications for waiver under Articles 5 and 18b were received by the Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Board was asked by resolutions of local education authorities to waive Article 5 in the case of sixty schools, and Article 18b in the case of twenty-eight schools. A full return of such cases, with the necessary explanations, will shortly be issued by the Board.

Ballinclare Motor Fatality.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland if the attention of the Government has been called to the case of Andrew Carton, of Boley, who was killed by a motor car at Ballinclare, between Gorey and Camolin, County Wexford, on 23rd May; whether they have received a resolution from the Camolin and Ballyduff Farmers' Association, requesting to have the inquest on this case reopened; and what steps they propose to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) I am informed that the evidence given at the inquest in this case showed that the young man Carton lost control of the bicycle which he was riding and collided with a motor car, thereby losing his life. The driver of the motor car is stated to have himself narrowly escaped losing his life owing to his efforts to avoid the bicycle. The coroner's jury exonerated the driver of the motor car from blame, and the Government are not aware of any reason why the matter should be reopened. The resolution referred to has not been received.

University College, North Wales.

MR. REES: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the resolution passed by the court of governors of the University College of North Wales, Aberystwyth, to the effect that the Government grants at present given to the Welsh University colleges are totally inadequate, and urging the Government, in view of the lack of educational endowments in Wales, the poverty of students attending, and the advanced work done in the colleges, to increase the grants to the three colleges at the earliest opportunity.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The question of grants to the Welsh University colleges is under consideration by a Committee appointed for the purpose, and I am unable to make any statement on the subject at present.

Friendly Society Certificates of Thrift.

MR. WILES (Islington, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Government, in providing for the acceptance of certificates of thrift from friendly societies under Clause 3, Section (1), subsection (*b*), of the Old-Age Pensions Bill, intend to direct that such certificates may be admissible if given, respectively, by any society registered under the Friendly Societies Act, any similar society although not registered under the Act, and other types of society which, while established for the purpose of promotion of thrift, are not confined to the provision of benefits in sickness and death.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) It is not the intention that any distinction should be drawn between registered societies and non-registered societies, as such, whose operations are directed to the encouragement of thrift.

Uganda Railway.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will agree to a Return showing the complete accounts of the capital expenditure on the Uganda Railway, the charge involved upon the Exchequer by that capital expenditure, the gross and net earnings of the line for each year since it was opened, together with an Estimate of the further capital, if any, required to equip it for traffic.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to reply. A Return containing the information desired shall be prepared and presented to Parliament.

Savings Banks and State Aid.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the statement made by Sir E. W. Hamilton, in his evidence given to the Select Committee on the Savings Banks Funds of 1902, that State aid to savings banks would have a very demoralising effect; and whether, seeing that for some years past State aid has been given to the savings banks by making good deficiencies in the working accounts of both the Post Office Savings Bank and the Trustee Savings Banks, he purposes to take any measures to put an end to the demoralising effect resulting from this State aid.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The position of the Government in relation to this question was explained by my predecessor in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for Preston on 19th March. He then stated that, although no sufficient reason has yet arisen for departing from the policy approved by the last House of Commons in 1904, the subject is one that requires to be, and is, kept steadily in view.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Wireless Telegraphy.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the wireless telegraphic messages sent by His Majesty's ships are continually tapped by ships in the merchant service, both British and foreign, equipped with the wireless apparatus; and whether there are wireless systems in use which, owing to tuning, cannot be tapped.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton): The Admiralty have not found any system of wireless telegraphy which cannot be tapped by other ships and stations possessing suitable instruments.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the system of wireless telegraphy used by the Admiralty requires so much horse-power for long-distance messages that it is not possible to send messages any considerable distance from ship to shore; whether there are other wireless systems in regular use which do not require so much horse-power as the system employed by the Admiralty; and whether the Government will appoint a Committee of experts to advise the Admiralty as to the best system of wireless telegraphy to use in the Navy.

MR. LAMBERT: The Answer to the first and last parts of the hon. Member's Question is in the negative. So far as is known there are no other systems which require less horse-power than the Admiralty system to ensure reliable communication.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Are we to understand from that reply that the Admiralty are satisfied with the existing system?

MR. LAMBERT: No doubt it is capable of improvement, but we think it is the best available at present.

Naval Volunteers (Lands) Bill.

MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the exigencies of Parliamentary time will now permit of his taking the next stage of the Naval Volunteers (Lands) Bill, of which notice was given on 29th January.

MR. LAMBERT: It is hoped that the Bill will be passed this session, but it is not yet possible to announce the day of taking the next stage.

Australian Commonwealth and the Navy.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the naval arrangements have been concluded between His Majesty's Government and the Commonwealth of Australia; and if he can state what has been the delay in bringing the matter to a close.

MR. LAMBERT: The Answer to the Question is in the negative. I can only refer the hon. Member to the reply given to him by the First Lord of the Admiralty on 21st May. The subject is an exceedingly complex one, and the scheme put forward by the Australian Government requires much amplification.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Can the hon. Gentleman indicate in any way when this matter is likely to be brought to a settlement, or say what is the point about which there is a difficulty in coming to a conclusion?

MR. LAMBERT: I cannot give the hon. Gentleman any information as to when it is likely to be settled, and it would be too long in an Answer to a Question to give him details of the points which are being considered by the Australian Government and the Board of Admiralty.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will put an unstarred Question down for next week.

Fires on Government Property.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty how many fires have occurred by which Government property has been destroyed during the last two years; and how many of those fires occurred during the night, and the highest amount of loss occasioned by any one fire.

MR. LAMBERT: Eleven fires have occurred during the last two years, and, as far as is known, five have occurred at night. The highest amount of loss occasioned by any one fire is, approximately, £5,869.

Royal Irish Rifles.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the strength of the 3rd, 4th, and 5th Battalions Royal Irish Rifles in officers, non-commissioned officers, and men on assembling for annual training this year, the number who have joined the Special Reserve, and the number who have taken their discharge from each battalion, respectively; and can he state, with regard to the total number who have joined the Special Reserve, how many have joined for one year and longer periods, respectively.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. ACLAND, Yorkshire, Richmond): As these battalions only finished training on Saturday last, I am not yet in possession of the particulars asked for, but I will call for a Report and furnish the hon. and gallant Member with the information.

Manufacture of Scottish Tartans.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the cloth of which the uniforms of Scottish regiments are made is manufactured by and purchased from Scottish manufacturers; and, if so, whether the like treatment will be accorded to manufacturers in Wales in respect of the uniforms of Welsh regiments.

MR. ACLAND: Highland tartan for the Army is made exclusively in Scotland. Should any Welsh manufacturers desire to tender for Army cloths, the War Office will be glad to receive applications.

*MR. REES: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that a strong impression prevails in Wales that the Scottish by some superior craft or subtlety get better terms in this respect?

MR. ACLAND: I do believe they make the cloth better.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Are we to understand that Scottish tartan is to be made in Wales?

MR. ACLAND: If the Welsh could make any cloth good enough, we should be glad, I think, to buy it from Wales.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): Will the War Office take care to procure the best cloth for this purpose at the least possible cost?

MR. ACLAND: Certainly.

*MR. REES: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that in Wales he can obtain those conditions?

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): It is in Scotland that those conditions prevail.

AN HON. MEMBER: And is this the United Kingdom!

Army Service Corps.

MR. HOWARD (Cumberland, Eskdale): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the practice not to grant corps pay to officers of the Army Service Corps when they are students of the staff college; and whether, in view of the fact that this involves a diminution of pay which makes it impossible for officers living on their pay to attend the college, he can see his way in future to grant the pay to officers so serving.

MR. ACLAND: Corps pay is issuable under the Regulations to officers of the Army Service Corps for every day on which they are employed on the duties of their corps: but when studying at the staff college with a view to qualifying for a beneficial appointment, they are not so employed, and like officers of other corps at the staff college they cease to receive the extra pay to which they are entitled when employed regimentally.

Assam Bengal Railway.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the attention of the Secretary of State has been called to the frequent thefts which have taken place on the Assam Bengal Railway; whether he is aware that this fact, and the recent fires at the jetties at Chittagong, have seriously prejudiced the interests of the planting community and of the public of the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam; and whether he will take steps to prevent a recurrence of the said railway thefts and jetty fires.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The Local Government are fully alive to the importance of ensuring the security of goods on the Assam Bengal Railway and the jetties at Chittagong, and have now under their consideration the Report of a Committee appointed in March last to consider the question.

Communications with Tibet.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether it is proposed by the Government of India to make any allotments of funds for the improvement of communications with Tibet in order to the development of the trade of that country with India.

MR. BUCHANAN: No proposals have been submitted to the Secretary of State by the Government of India for improving the roads from India into Tibet.

*MR. REES: If this is not done, what advantage will the Government receive from the late expedition?

MR. BUCHANAN: That raises a very wide question, and it is impossible for me to give an answer.

Madras Landed Estates Bill.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the sanction of the Government of India has yet been accorded to the Madras Landed Estates Bill.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Answer is in the negative.

Cost of Protecting the British Legation at Teheran.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether the cost of the eight soldiers of the Indian Army stationed for the protection of the British Legation at Teheran is being borne by the Indian or by the Home Government.

MR. BUCHANAN: The cost of the Legation guard at Teheran is divided equally between the British and Indian Exchequers in accordance with the practice by which all diplomatic and Consular expenditure in Persia is so divided.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Is it proposed to increase this guard?

MR. BUCHANAN: That is not a matter which falls within my Department.

Indentured Labour from Madagascar.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what communications have passed between

His Majesty's Government, that of France, and the Government of the Transvaal, since February, 1908, in respect of the recruiting of indentured labourers from Madagascar.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): No communications passed between His Majesty's Government and that of France. The Governor-General of Madagascar spoke in public strongly against the proposal, and it was understood that the French Government shared his objections. The Transvaal Government have since informed the Secretary of State that it is not desired that any further action should be taken in the matter.

Tristan d'Acunha.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrew's Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give any information as to the condition of the inhabitants of Tristan d'Acunha and the date of the last communications.

COLONEL SEELY: A Report dated 28th April, has been received recently from the Rev. J. G. Barrow, the clergyman on the island, from which it appears that the islanders have not been subject to any privation lately. During 1907 twenty-eight ships were sighted, of which seven were boarded and letters were able to be sent off five times. According to this Report, Mr. Keytal, of Messrs. Stephan Bros., Capetown, intends to remain on the island this year with the object of working up a trade. He appears to have sent about 200 sheep to Capetown.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: May I have a copy of the Report, if it is not confidential?

COLONEL SEELY: I have not seen the Report; I will let the hon. Member know if he can have it.

Nigeria—Land Alienation.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, pending the Report of the Committee on Northern Nigerian land, he will suspend the alienation of land in Southern Nigeria where the conditions are similar.

COLONEL SEELY: Under the Native Lands Acquisition Ordinance, which applies to the whole of the Protectorate of Southern Nigeria, no alien may acquire any interest or right in or over any lands in the Protectorate from a native except under an instrument which has received the approval in writing of the Governor, and the Governor has been instructed that only grants on leasehold tenure should be approved.

MR. WEDGWOOD: Does that also apply to the Colony of Lagos?

COLONEL SEELY: I am not sure. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will put that Question down.

Lagos Railway Lands.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many of the 1,800 plots along the Lagos Railway that have been surveyed have been sold, how many leased, and for what length of lease.

COLONEL SEELY: I have not the particulars asked for by my hon. friend, but the Governor will be requested to supply them.

Sedition in Korea—Case of Mr. Bethell.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the prosecution of Mr. Bethell for spreading sedition in Korea through his newspaper was undertaken at the instance of the Japanese Government; and whether the rebellion which Mr. Bethell was fomenting was rebellion against the Japanese Government or against the Korean State.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The attention of His Majesty's Government was drawn to the conduct of Mr. Bethell by the Japanese Government, as well as by complaints emanating from non-Japanese sources; as regards the second Question, Mr. Bethell was prosecuted under Article 5 of the China and Corea

(Amendment) Order in Council, 1907, which provides (amongst other things) that "every person subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the Court, who prints, publishes, or offers for sale any printed or written newspaper or other publication containing seditious matter shall be guilty of a grave offence against the Principal Order." By Sub-Article (3) of the above Article, it is provided that "matter calculated to excite tumult or disorder . . . . shall be deemed to be seditious matter within the meaning of this Article." The case does not seem to me to be affected by the question whether the Government of Korea is controlled by Japan or not.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. SMEATON,

SIR EDWARD GREY said seditious matter was described as matter calculated to incite to disorder.

Case of Mr. Luxenburg.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is yet in a position to announce the result of his claim on the Russian Government for compensation in connection with the unwarranted arrest and imprisonment of Mr. Luxenburg.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Points which have arisen in connection with the case are still being considered in consultation with the Law Officers of the Crown. I cannot make any further statement.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I will repeat the Question this day week.

Persian Unrest—British Legation Guard at Teheran.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will consider the advisability of reinforcing the garrison of eight men of the Indian Native Cavalry guarding the British Legation at Teheran.

SIR EDWARD GREY: His Majesty's *Charge d'Affaires* has reported on more than one occasion that he anticipates no danger to Europeans in Teheran. I do not, therefore, propose to take any steps to reinforce the Legation guard unless he should state that he considers it advisable to do so.

The Position at Tabriz.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any intention of sending help to the British Consul-General at Tabriz to safeguard the lives, property, and interests of British subjects in that city, where the mob are reported to have seized the arsenal and to have the upper hand.

SIR EDWARD GREY: There is no reason to suppose, from the reports received from His Majesty's Legation at Teheran, that the lives, property, and interests of British subjects at Tabriz are in any danger. His Majesty's Consul-General at that place has at his disposal a guard of six mounted men of the Indian Army.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman when the latest communication was received from Tabriz, and whether telegraphic communication has been or is now interrupted?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No, Sir. We had the last telegram yesterday.

Martial Law in Persia—Employment of Russian Officers.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Persia has been placed under martial law, which is to be administered by military officers of the Russian Imperial Service; and, if so, what steps, if any, are being taken by the Government to have constitutional government re-established in that country.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Shah has issued a proclamation placing Persia under martial law. I am not sure what appointments the Shah has given to Russian officers. His Majesty's Government do not propose to interfere in the internal government of Persia.

Russian Tea Duties.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the contemplated revision of the Russian duties on Indian and Ceylon teas implies the removal of the imposts placed upon these teas in 1903, or the admission of all teas, whether they come from India, Ceylon, China, Java, or Japan, on the some footing, whether imported by way of Europe or Eastern Asia.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The former is the case; it is the imposts placed in 1906 that are to be removed.

Protestant Missions in the Congo Free State.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is now in a position to state what the result of his representations to the Government of the Congo Free State has been regarding the refusal of that Government to grant or sell sites for Protestant missions within the State.

SIR EDWARD GREY: No communications on the subject have passed with the Congo Government since the correspondence which was presented to the House in Papers Africa No. 2. In the event of annexation being delayed beyond the present session of the Belgian Parliament, the Congo Government will be pressed to give effect to the assurance referred to in their note of 28th March, last.

Brussels Arms Conference.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when the Brussels Arms Conference may be expected to conclude their labours; whether all that they can do is to report to their respective Governments the steps they may think it desirable to take; and whether, as the trade in arms through Muscat is increasingly dangerous and the Brussels Conference may take some time to report, he will consider the advisability of using pressure on the Imam of Muscat to stop this trade as much as possible.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot name any definite day at present as to when the Arms Conference may be expected to conclude its labours. I presume that certain arrangements will be drawn up by the Conference which will be signed or reserved as the case may be by the representatives of the various Powers. As regards the suggested representations to the Sultan of Muscat, the matter has to be considered in connection with the obligations imposed on the Sultan by his treaties with other Powers besides Great Britain, and I can only repeat that the matter continues to occupy our attention.

In answer to a further Question by MR. HART-DAVIES——

SIR EDWARD GREY said the whole subject of this trade in arms was engaging the attention of the Government.

*MR. REES: Could it not be provided that European Powers when adopting new arms should not dispose of the discarded weapons in suspected quarters, for which they would be likely to be used on our frontiers.

SIR EDWARD GREY asked for notice.

Russian Legation Guard at Teheran.

MR. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Russian Government are making any, and, if so, what, additions to the troops guarding their legation at Teheran; also whether there are any precedents for the participation by foreign officers on the active list of their own armies in acts of civil war in the country to which they have been lent by their own Government.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information to the effect that the Russian Government are increasing their legation guard at Teheran. There are, I am informed, several precedents for the loan to foreign Governments of officers on the active list, whose services would not necessarily be affected by the internal situation in the countries where they are employed.

MR. LYNCH: Can the right hon. Gentleman cite one instance in our own case?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I should imagine the appointment of General Gordon was one.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Has the right hon. Gentleman any information as to the strength of the Russian guard?

Sir EDWARD GREY asked for notice.

Macedonian Agreement.

Mr. LYNCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will arrange that the Papers embodying the agreement arrived at with Russia over the Macedonian question shall be presented to Parliament before the Foreign Office Vote is taken.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I can give no definite undertaking; it depends upon the progress of negotiations with other Powers.

Mr. LYNCH asked when Papers would be laid?

Sir EDWARD GREY: As soon as we come to an agreement with the other Powers. Then we shall lay Papers on the points on which we are agreed. I can make no promise beyond that.

Persian Refugees in the Teheran Consulate.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British consulate at Teheran is surrounded by Persian troops and all persons examined who pass in or out; and whether he can now state the nature of the securities which will be required before any refugees now in the consulate will be surrendered to the Shah's Government.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The Persian troops who surrounded His Majesty's legation at Teheran have now been withdrawn. With regard to the last part of the hon. Member's Question, we require a written guarantee of the safety of the lives, persons, and property of refugees before requesting them to leave the legation; and in the case of any accused of crimes as distinct from political offences an assurance before surrendering them, that they should have a fair trial at which a member of the legation would be present.

The Reval Meeting.

Mr. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the internal affairs of Persia were discussed at the recent meeting at Reval between His Majesty the King and the Czar of Russia.

Sir EDWARD GREY: Persian affairs were very little touched upon during the visit to Reval, and what mention of them there was related solely to frontier disputes and commercial matters. But the condition of internal affairs in Persia has formed the subject of communication between the two Governments on various occasions both before and since the visit to Reval.

United States Liquor Licence Duties.

Mr. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can state the rates of duty charged on liquor licences in the States of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New York; whether he can give the total sums annually raised by such duties for each class of licence and the number of such licences in these high-licence States; and, if he is not in possession of the facts, whether he would request His Majesty's Embassy at Washington to supplement their Report No. 657, of 1907, by furnishing the information.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The information asked for by my hon. friend in the first part of the Question is rather too long to be stated in a verbal Answer, but will be circulated with the Votes. As regards the second part of the Question, I will cause inquiries to be made at Washington.

The Imprisoned Suffragists.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will take steps to ensure that women sent to prison as political offenders, whether in default of payment of fines or otherwise, shall receive the same treatment as men when imprisoned as political offenders.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): Except where there is an express direction in the statute (as in the case of contempt of Court or seditious libel) the treatment of a prisoner in prison depends entirely on the order of the Court. Whether offenders are sentenced to imprisonment in the first, in the second, or in the third division, no distinction in treatment is made between men and women. I have no reason to think that the orders made by the Court in the case of women have in any instance been more severe than the orders made in similar circumstances on men offenders.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that when Dr. Jameson was put in gaol for a political offence he was accorded special treatment; and whether, as there was considerable feeling on this subject of the treatment of women in prison, he would, on account of their more highly-strung temperament, direct that they be more considerately dealt with.

MR. GLADSTONE: The case of Dr. Jameson was totally different. He was convicted.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Will not the right hon. Gentleman reconsider the position generally, with a view to taking steps in this matter?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am afraid I cannot reconsider the law. The matter is entirely in the discretion of the magistrates.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman issue a circular to magistrates or take some step of that nature?

MR. GLADSTONE: The matter must rest with the magistrate.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: But surely the right hon. Gentleman has discretionary power. He has used it before.

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir, I have no discretionary power.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: But has not the right hon. Gentleman made representations to magistrates?

*MR. SPEAKER: Really, the hon. Member should give notice of some of these Questions.

MR. T. M. HEALY subsequently asked the Home Secretary if he was aware that one of the ladies who had been imprisoned, Miss Logan, was the daughter of a former Member of the House of Commons, whom they all respected, and whether some means could not be taken to alleviate the undoubted distress caused to these educated women by the kind of treatment they were receiving.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have really no power to interfere with the discretion of the magistrate. I must remind the hon. and learned Gentleman that these ladies are surety prisoners and can come out at any moment they like.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E): Is it not fair and reasonable, to say the least, that these ladies should not be treated more harshly in prison than were Dr. Jameson and other men who plunged this country into war?

MR. CLAUDE HAY: Is it not the fact that as a result of representations the right hon. Gentleman made to a certain magistrate on one occasion the ladies in prison did get better treatment?

MR. GLADSTONE: Two years ago I did make representations to a certain magistrate and he was pleased to take notice of them. But it was his own action.

MR. T. M. HEALY: If a person went down and gave bail for these ladies would they be turned out?

MR. GLADSTONE: It might be a good thing to try.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman make similar representations in these cases to those which he made two years ago?

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Considering that these ladies are specially desirous of going to prison, would not to turn them out of prison be the best punishment?

[No Answer was returned.]

Police and the Suffragist Raid.

MAJOR RENTON (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what extra labour was entailed on the Metropolitan Police, and at what cost to the public, if any, on 30th June by their duties in carrying out the sessional order prohibiting meetings in the vicinity of the Houses of Parliament.

MR. GLADSTONE: 1,694 extra police were employed on 30th June, but I am not able to state what was the total amount of extra labour involved. The cost to the public is represented by the expenses of travelling incurred by men brought in from distant places, and by the payment of refreshment allowance to those on duty for nine hours or more. This has not yet been ascertained.

Church Army Midnight March.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received any report from the police, in the ordinary course, with regard to scenes of drunkenness on the occasion of a midnight march in a limited area of Westminster on the night of 4th April last; whether he ordered a special report to be made by the police present during the march; and, if so, whether he will state what number of men, if any, in a drunken condition the police reported to have been in the streets on that occasion.

MR. GLADSTONE: No report from the police was received by me on the occasion of the procession of members of the Church Army to which the hon. Member refers, but I have made inquiry, and am informed by the Commissioner of Police that the officers who accompanied the procession state that no case of drunkenness was observed by them in the streets through which the procession passed.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS: May I ask if there is any confirmation at all in the report of the statement widely published that from 150 to 200 men in a drunken condition were met in the area during that march?

MR. GLADSTONE: I know nothing whatever of the statement to which my hon. friend refers, but I have given the facts of the case.

*MR. LEIF JONES: Was a report deemed unnecessary because there was no unusual amount of drunkenness on that occasion?

MR. GLADSTONE: I can only repeat that no case of drunkenness was brought under the notice of the police.

Motor-Bus Fatalities.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the number of accidents, fatal or otherwise, due to motor-buses during the last two months in London and the surrounding districts; in what portion of greater London have these accidents been most frequent; and what steps he proposes to take to remedy the evil.

MR. GLADSTONE: The number of accidents in the Metropolitan Police District, caused by motor-buses, including both those which did and those which did not cause personal injuries, was 334 in April, and 483 in May. Five persons were fatally injured by such accidents in April, and 12 in May. The figures for June are not yet available. Such accidents have been most frequent in Oxford Street, where 67 occurred; in Barking Road with 30; and in the King's Road, Chelsea, with 33, during the time mentioned. As I have often said, the police do their very best, under the existing law, to put a stop to dangerous driving, but I am considering whether it would not be possible, and, if so, whether it might not be desirable, to reduce the speed limit of motor-omnibuses to ten miles an hour as a condition of their licence.

Female Criminals.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when it will be possible for his Department to extend the benefit of the Borstal system to the woman criminal.

MR. GLADSTONE: If the Bill now before the House becomes law, the necessary arrangements will be made for this purpose.

Chief Constables of County Police.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that only five out of the fifty-six chief constables of counties in England and Wales have been raised from the ranks; if so, will he say what class of men are preferred for these positions to those trained to the business; and will he indicate to the local authorities who have the appointments that he will not give his approval to others than constables until the proportion of those from the ranks is much increased.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am not aware of the precise number of chief constables who can be described as having risen from the ranks, either in counties, where the proportion is small, or in boroughs, where it is much larger. Among the chief constables are included former officers of the Navy and Army, the Royal Irish Constabulary, and members of other public services, in which they have acquired the necessary qualifications. The selection of chief constables is made by the local authorities; and I could not properly interfere with the full responsibility and discretion which they are bound to exercise by giving any such direction as is suggested.

Lead Poisoning at Tunstall.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether there has been reported to the Home Office an extraordinary incidence of lead-poisoning at the Woodland Pottery, Tunstall; whether a portion of Rule 2 in the amended special rules, established by the award of Lord James of Hereford, declares that if any factory to which the rule applies shall, by reason of the occurrence of cases of lead-poisoning, appear to the Secretary of State to be in an unsatisfactory condition he may prohibit the use of lead; whether this rule has been put in force; and whether he will consider the propriety of applying it to such cases.

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir, eleven cases of lead-poisoning at these works (three of which, however, are doubtful) have been reported to the Factory Department, during the current year, as compared with three in 1907, none in 1906, two in 1905, nine in 1904, and one in 1903. Proceedings were taken in April last against the firm, and application made under Section 18 for an order prohibiting the works being used until the necessary alterations had been made. On the firm giving an undertaking to remedy the defective arrangements for drying and ware-cleaning, to which the heavy incidence of poisoning is attributed, the stipendiary, with the concurrence of the medical inspector and lady inspector in charge of the case, adjourned the hearing. The alterations, which are a difficult matter and will cost, I understand, some £5,000, are now being carried out, and are to be completed by 23rd August. As regards the second part of the Question, there is such a power as mentioned in the special rules; it is a power which is intended only for very exceptional cases and has not hitherto been used. In view of the action of the stipendiary, I do not think I could properly direct action to be taken under this special power at present; but the works will be kept under observation and if the heavy incidence of poisoning continues, I shall consider what further action, whether under the rule or otherwise, is required.

Miners (Eight Hours) Bill.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can inform the House, approximately, upon what date the last ballot with regard to the eight-hours day in coal mines was taken by the Miners' Federation; and what were the specific questions then voted on by its members.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am afraid I have nothing to add to the answer which I gave to a previous Question of the hon. Member on this subject on 7th May last.

The Patents Act.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether diplomatic representations have been made asking for an extension of the time-limit under the new patent law beyond 28th August, 1908; and, if so, what is the decision of the Government in this behalf.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): Representations have been received from the Governments of the United States and of Germany in respect of Section 27 of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907, but His Majesty's Government have no intention of proposing the fresh legislation which I am advised would be necessary in order to modify the provisions of the section.

Unemployment.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware of the fact that unemployment reached the percentage of 7·9 during the month of May; whether he can inform the House of the last year in which unemployment reached so high a figure during that month; whether he has any figures to show the amount of unemployment in London and the surrounding districts as compared with other parts of the country during May; also the amount of pauperism as compared with other parts of the country; and whether, in view of the fact that legislation based upon the Report of the Poor Law Commission will not be possible this year, he can state the steps which the Government is proposing to take to tide over the intervening period of unemployment.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. MASTERMAN, West Ham, N.): I am aware that the Returns made by trade unions to the Board of Trade show that in May last 7·9 of the members were unemployed. The extent of the unemployment was considerably affected by the industrial disputes in the engineering and shipbuilding trades. The latest date at which an equally high proportion of unemployment was shown in the Returns, was, I understand, May, 1887. So far as can be ascertained 7·5 per cent. of the members of the trade unions in the London district making Returns were unemployed at the end of May last. The number of persons receiving Poor Law relief at the same date in London and in the adjoining Poor Law unions was 160,698 or 22·5 per 1,000 of the population, the corresponding proportion in England and Wales generally being 22·3 per 1,000. The Government propose to renew for another year the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn) asked whether the Board of Trade Returns did not exclude unemployment on account of strikes and lock-outs.

MR. MASTERMAN said that was so; but the unemployed in subsidiary trades affected by strikes and lock-outs were included.

Westerhope School Site.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board why the Local Government Board in May, 1907, sanctioned a loan which included a loan of about £698 as the purchase price of about three-quarters of an acre for school purposes, between Westerhope and North Warbottle, in Northumberland, of which the annual value for rating is about 27s. a year; and whether the Board will take steps to avoid sanctioning further loans for the purchase of land at exorbitant prices.

MR. MASTERMAN: I can assure my hon. friend that the Local Government Board will take all possible steps to prevent the purchase of land at exorbitant prices where it is in their power to do so. As regards the particular case to which he refers, at the time the loan was sanctioned the annual value of the land for rating purposes had not been ascertained, and the Board's attention was not drawn to its high price. I may add that had not the loan been sanctioned the two parishes served by the school would have had to pay three-fourths of the cost of the site, or more than £500 out of one year's rates.

Mr. WEDGWOOD: When a county council makes a bargain, and three-fourths of the cost has to be paid by the parish is that body to have no voice in the matter?

Mr. MASTERMAN: The purchase was carried out by the county council with the sanction of the Board of Education. The Local Government Board sanctioned the loan at the request of the county council. Had there been no sanction three-fourths of the cost would have fallen on the parish.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): If the Local Government Board knew the price was excessive why did they sanction it.

Mr. MASTERMAN: In these cases they do not make detailed inquiries unless some local objection is taken. In this case although local objection was taken at the county council, it was not sent to the Local Government Board.

Cash on Delivery in Morocco.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the cash on delivery service will be extended to Casablanca and to all places in Morocco where the British Post Office maintains an agency instead of being confined to Tangier alone, seeing the boon such a step would be to British residents.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): In view of the present state of affairs in Morocco, and of the novelty of the cash-on-delivery system, I think it desirable to await some experience of the working of the service before extending it as the hon. Member suggests.

Expenses of Local Education Authorities.

Mr. ALDEN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he has made any provision whatever for additional grants to local educational authorities in view of the extra expense entailed by medical inspection and the importance of encouraging such authorities, many of which are at present financially crippled, to carry out the wishes of his Department.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): I regret I can add nothing to the statements which have already been made by my predecessor to the effect that the Government are unable to hold out any hope of a special grant in aid of medical inspection in anticipation of the additional sum which has been promised in connection with the Education Bill now before the House.

Mr. ALDEN: May I ask whether in the cases in which the expense has already been incurred that will be taken into account? Did not the right hon. Gentleman promise that assistance should be given in these cases?

[No Answer was returned.]

Bristol Post Office.

Mr. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the contractor, Mr. Blake, of Plymouth, who is building a new wing to the post office in Small Street, Bristol, is not paying the recognised trade union rates of wages for overtime, and if he intends taking any action in the matter.

*The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. L. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale): It appears that a small amount of overtime has been worked under a misunderstanding at less than the standard rates for such work. I am taking steps to secure that the standard rates shall be paid during the continuance of the contract.

Small Holdings Act—Schemes Submitted.

Mr. MONTAGU (Cambridgeshire, Chesterton): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if any county councils have submitted to the Board more than one scheme under the Small Holdings Act, of 1907; how much land has been purchased under schemes which have been approved; how much land has been leased; and whether any schemes which necessitate the use of compulsory powers have been submitted or approved.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): The Gloucester County Council have submitted six schemes; Norfolk, four; and the Isle of Wight, two. In regard to the ten schemes which have been provisionally approved or confirmed, it is proposed to purchase 315½ acres and to lease 455 acres. No schemes have yet been submitted which necessitate the use of compulsory powers.

Small Holdings Act—Preliminary Inquiries.

MR. MONTAGU: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Commissioners appointed under the Small Holdings Act of 1907 have visited every county council area to which the Act applies; whether there is any area in which no action is being taken by the county council to ascertain the demand for small holdings; whether, although the Act provides that the Commissioners should ascertain such demand, in fact the county councils are doing this, from what source if the Commissioners acted as the Act provides would the expenses of such inquiry be defrayed; and from what source are the expenses of such inquiries now, in fact, being defrayed.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Commissioners, or an inspector acting under their instructions, have visited every administrative county except the Scilly Isles, and every county council is taking steps to ascertain the demand. The Act provides that councils shall furnish the Commissioners with such information as they may reasonably require, and this is what the councils have been doing. The expenses of their preliminary inquiries are defrayed out of the county rate. Similar expenses incurred by the Commissioners are paid out of money provided by Parliament.

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): Is there anything to prevent the county councils putting the expenses of these inquiries on the rents of the small holdings?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Certainly.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): Is there any power under the Act allowing county councils to charge these expenses out of the rates?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: These preliminary expenses can be charged out of the rates.

Small Holdings Act—Time of Holding Inquiries.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board of Agriculture have any information at their disposal showing in how many districts meetings have been held by county councils for the purpose of hearing applications under the Small Holdings Act at an hour when agricultural labourers and others who are occupied all day can attend; and, if not, whether the Board will take steps to obtain such information.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Such information as the Board possess on this subject does not suggest that any general inquiry is necessary, but the matter will be kept in view by the Commissioners who are in continuous communication with county councils.

Hollesley Bay Colony.

MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board will send down to Hollesley Bay a Commissioner to investigate and Report upon the agricultural value of the work done on the farm, and lay the Report upon the Table before the Local Government Board Vote is taken.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I would refer my hon. friend to my reply to his Question on this subject on the 22nd ult. The Board regret that they do not see their way to take the course suggested.

Expenses under the Small Holdings Act.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the salaries and expenses of any officers appointed by a county council for the purposes of establishing small holdings, and any salaries and expenses connected with the management and supervisions of small holdings after they are established, will be recouped by putting additional rent on the land occupied by the small holders.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Small Holdings Act, 1892, requires councils to fix the rents at such reasonable amounts as will in their opinion guard them against loss. The Board have no power to decide what expenses must be taken into consideration by a council in carrying out this provision.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Is the meaning of that that the expenses are placed on the rents of the small holdings?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The meaning is that no loss shall fall on the county rate.

Small Holdings Act—Purchase of Land in Excess of Demand.

MR. RENDALL (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether a county council having applications for 200 acres of land in one place under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, and having a suitable farm of, say 280 acres offered to it, is precluded by the Act from taking such farm, even though there be no difficulty in letting off the 80 acres not applied for to another tenant.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: A council is not precluded by the Act from acquiring an area in excess of that for which they have received applications.

Co-operative Societies and Small Holdings.

MR. RENDALL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Board's model rules as to the profits of a co-operative society letting small holdings and allotments, as laid down by subsections (1) and (5), will allow a society to put to the special reserve accounts such moneys as it thinks are required to provide against losses which may be incurred through defaulting tenants.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The rules provide for the creation of a reserve fund applicable for the purpose to which my hon. friend refers.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: Have the Board any power to limit the profits, seeing that this House expressly refused to put into the Bill any such limitation? Further, will increased profits by these trading companies be made by an increase of rents?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Certainly the Board have power to prevent more than a certain profit being made.

Loans to Jamaica.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any sums have been issued to Jamaica under Section 4 of the Public Works Act 1907; whether any applications have been received for loans; and what communications, if any, have passed between His Majesty's Government and that of Jamaica on the subject of financial aid for Jamaica.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): Application has recently been made by Jamaica for the advance of £50,000 as the first instalment of the loan authorised by Section 4 of the Public Works Loans Act, 1907, and the money will be advanced in the course of the next few days.

Industrial Spirits.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that, according to the provisions of Section 8 of the Finance Act of 1902, the Commissioners of Inland Revenue may authorise the use of spirits, without payment of duty, in art or manufacture; and can he state what special conditions other than those set out in the section have to be fulfilled by an applicant who desires to avail himself of the provisions of this section.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The conditions with which an applicant is required to comply, other than those set out in the section referred to, are mainly administrative, and a copy of them can be obtained upon application to the Board of Inland Revenue at Somerset House.

MR. NANNETTI: May I ask the hon. Gentleman whether, if I can give him a concrete case of refusal to allow the privileges set out in Section 8 to a manufacturer in Dublin for the purposes of his trade, and who is willing to give the undertaking specified in the section referred to, will he see that instructions are given to the applicant as to the steps he should take to have the permission asked for granted?

MR. HOBHOUSE: If the hon. Member will forward me particulars of the case I will give them careful consideration.

Revenue Statistics.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state what percentage proportions of revenue derived from direct and indirect taxes, respectively, bear to the total revenue of Ireland and Great Britain taken separately from the latest available figures subsequent to the financial year, 1903–4, omitting the figures for the amount contributed per head.

MR. HOBHOUSE: My right hon. friend has had a statement prepared in tabular form, which shall be circulated with the Votes.

Old-Age Pension Disqualification Clause.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is the intention of the Government to fix a qualifying period in the Old-Age Pensions Bill now before Parliament in respect to the aged poor who, since 1st January, have received outdoor relief, as is done in the case of recipients of outdoor relief under the Registration of Voters law, and, if so, will it be a fixed date or simply a twelve months interval; and would he, in view of the strong feeling expressed in all parts of the House on this question, consider the desirability of altering the date of disqualification from 1st January to 30th June.

MR. HOBHOUSE: My right hon. friend can add nothing to what he said during the debate on the Committee Stage of the Bill in which the points raised by the Question were fully discussed.

Civil Servants and Territorial Camps.

MR. GIBBS (Bristol, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a circular has been sent round to all the Government offices stating the terms and conditions under which public servants will be granted leave to attend the annual training of the Territorial Army.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The necessary instructions have been given to the Departments concerned.

Scottish Local Government Bill.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can give any information as to the Government's intentions to introduce a Bill to replace the Local Government (Scotland) (No. 2) Bill, which he hoped to introduce this session.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): I still hope to introduce such a Bill this session if the course of business permits, and I regret that its introduction hitherto with any prospect of progress has not been possible.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Will the right hon. Gentleman bring in a Bill early next session?

MR. SINCLAIR: I have said I hope to do so this session.

New Fishery Cruiser for Scotland.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can now state the dimensions of the new fishery cruiser for Scotland; and when she will be completed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I regret that I am not yet able to do so.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware this is the sixth time I have asked this Question?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I cannot hold myself responsible for that.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Are there any reasons for not disclosing the dimensions of this vessel?

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Fishery Board are working hard on the ship—they are preparing the plans.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): Questions have been put to the Fishery Board for ten years, and we always get this sort of Answer.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): Has any money been paid for this cruiser yet?

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: When will the dimensions be given me?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not withholding any information which is available. There are hundreds of considerations to be borne in mind.

Irish Education Grant.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Treasury and the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have under their consideration a scheme whereby no part of the new school grant will be given to teachers of schools with an average below thirty-five; is he aware that the small schools were received into the system under rules which encouraged the establishment of such schools; can he state if the proposal referred to is devised for the purpose of starving out such schools, and whether under it certain teachers will be heavily penalised for no fault of their own; is he aware that small schools under Protestant management in isolated parts of Ireland will suffer particular hardship; and will he take steps to prevent this happening.

Mr. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): At the same time may I ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is intended that schools with an average attendance of less than thirty-five pupils are not to participate in the grant for the increase of teachers' salaries which he has promised on behalf of the Government; whether he is aware that this rule would exclude one-third of the National schools in Ireland, the teachers in which are underpaid; and whether he can make any statement which will reassure the teachers in these schools in regard to the allocation of the grant.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): The Supplementary Estimate, which has been before the House for some time past, shows that it is proposed to confine the new grant to the teachers of schools which have an average attendance of not less than thirty-five pupils. The Supplementary Estimate is to be considered this afternoon, and hon. Members will then have an opportunity of discussing the principles upon which the new grant is to be distributed. This Answer applies also to the Question of the hon. Member for West Belfast.

Mr. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) asked the effect of the increase of £20,000 on the allocation to schools with an average attendance of between twenty and thirty.

Mr. BIRRELL: I think I had better wait till I state our proposals more fully.

Mr. J. MURPHY: Is it meant for the excluded teachers and will it be an equal compensation to them for the sum which is to go to the remaining teachers?

Mr. BIRRELL: I would sooner not answer that Question now.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Is there any reason to believe that the small schools will suffer?

Mr. BIRRELL: All schools will be treated alike, whether Catholic or Protestant.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): But the hardship will fall on the Protestant schools, which constitute three-quarters of the total number.

Cattle-drive on the Castlefrench Estate, Roscommon.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that early on Thursday morning, 18th June last, the grass farms at Ballygar and Ballinamore, on the Castlefrench estate, county Roscommon, were cleared of all the cattle, the property of a Mr. Burns, by a crowd numbering some hundreds; how many arrests were made; and what sentences were passed.

MR. BIRRELL: On the morning of 16th June, fifteen head of cattle were driven off the farm of Mr. John Burns, near Ballinamore, by a large crowd, of whom fifty-three persons were identified by two policemen who were on duty at the place. Twenty-six of these persons were subsequently arrested, and all except one were bound to keep the peace.

Mulcair Lands, Limerick.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether Mr. Barrington, of Barrington's Bridge, Ahane, county Limerick, holds as yet the lands lately purchased from the representatives of the Dickson and Maunsell estates, commonly known as the Mulcair lands; and, if so, will he instruct the Estates Commissioners to put themselves in communication with the agent, Mr. John B. Barrington, with the view of ascertaining whether these lands are such as can be purchased by the Commissioners, so that, if purchased, they may be apportioned between the labourers and poor farmers' sons, who are very numerous in the locality.

MR. BIRRELL: The estate in question is known to the Estates Commissioners as the estate of W. D. Dickson and another. The Commissioners have informed the owners that it will not be possible for them to prepare a scheme for the division of the estate for some time to come, and have advised that in the meantime the lands should be let for grazing. The Commissioners are not aware whether Mr. Barrington is one of the persons to whom the lands have been let by the owners pending arrangements for sale.

Cloncurry Estate, Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that there is, among what were commonly called the Campaigned estates, one in the parish of Murroe, county Limerick, the Cloncurry estate, the tenants on which were allowed back on such disastrous terms that they have been crushed almost out of existence by exorbitant rents; and can he hold forth any hope to them, either by the likelihood of legislation dealing with such cases in the immediate future or by recommending the Estates Commissioners to open transactions with Lord Cloncurry for the sale of the estate to those overburdened tenants.

MR. BIRRELL: No proceedings for the sale of the estate in question have been instituted before the Estates Commissioners, and the Commissioners have no information as to the terms upon which the evicted tenants were reinstated, apparently some years ago. The Commissioners are prepared to consider any application which may be made to them either by the owner or the tenants.

Lord Inchiquin's Clare Estate.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any negotiations have taken place with regard to the purchase of the estate of Lord Inchiquin, county Clare; whether any writs have been issued for the recovery of rent on this property; and whether he will communicate with the Estates Commissioners with a view, if possible, of bringing about a satisfactory sale of the estate in question.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that no proceedings for the sale of this estate have been instituted before them, and they have no knowledge of any proceedings which the owner may have taken for the recovery of rent. The matter is not one in which the Commissioners could interfere.

The Dublin Crown Jewels.

Mr. MOORE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state who was responsible for the custody of the buildings in which the Regalia were kept at Dublin Castle; and if it was the fact that no one was allowed to reside in them out of office hours.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to his statement that no charge has been made against Sir Arthur Vicars except one of carelessness, he will state whether it is in accordance with precedent and practice to dismiss without pension on an unproved charge of carelessness an official of fifteen years' standing, as Sir Arthur Vicars was dismissed, owing to the loss of the Crown Jewels, the custody of which had only recently been legally vested in him.

I beg further to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the position of the safe in which the Crown Jewels were kept was condemned by the Vice-Regal Commission; whether he is also aware that the position was chosen, not by Sir Arthur Vicars, but by the Board of Works; and whether he will explain why Sir Arthur Vicars was refused another safe by the Board of Works when the existing one was found to be too large to go into the strong room.

And finally may I ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, prior to 1905 the custody of the Crown Jewels was legally vested in the Lord-Lieutenant by the old statutes of the Order of St. Patrick; and whether the custody of them was only made part of Sir Arthur Vicars' duty in the year 1905, subject, however, to the Royal Ordinance of His Majesty William IV. that the chief custody should remain in the hands of the Lord-Lieutenant.

Mr. BIRRELL: The subject matter of the four Questions which the hon. and learned Member has placed on the Paper was exhaustively dealt with by the Vice-Regal Commission appointed to investigate the circumstances of the loss of the Regalia of the Order of St. Patrick; and the information asked for may be obtained from the Report of the Commission and the Minutes of Evidence which have been presented to Parliament.

Mr. W. MOORE: Is it a fact that Sir Arthur Vicars was dismissed first and tried afterwards?

Mr. BIRRELL: I dare say that may be so.

Belfast Workhouse.

Mr. J. DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Report of the Local Government Board inspector, Mr. Agnew, on the Belfast Workhouse, and particularly to the inspector's references to the unsatisfactory nature of the nursing and medical arrangements; and whether any explanation has been forthcoming from the guardians with regard to these matters.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Report in question points out that the number of charge nurses employed in the Belfast Infirmary is too small in proportion to the number of probationers, and that in the auxiliary workhouse for consumptives the medical arrangements cannot be considered satisfactory. There are 1,600 beds in the infirmary, and about 180 nurses; and, apart from the matters mentioned, the inspector's comments upon the nursing and medical arrangements are most favourable. The guardians have adjourned the consideration of the Report in order that it may be printed and circulated among them.

Captain CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Belfast Workhouse has always been considered to be a model institution of its kind and its condition always looked upon as most satisfactory?

[No Answer was returned.]

Deportation of Paupers to Ireland.

Mr. J. DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total actual or approximate number of paupers deported from Great Britain to Ireland under the Poor Law Acts, and also the total number so deported since the beginning of the present year; whether the cost of deportation is borne by the British or by the Irish unions; what the average cost of each deportation is; and whether there is any information available showing the length of time that the persons so deported were living in the districts from which they were sent back to Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL: According to a Return to an order of the House of Lords, prepared in the year 1878, the number of paupers removed from England and Scotland to Ireland between 1st January, 1876, and 1st July, 1878, was 963. No more recent Return on the subject appears to have been prepared. Cases are reported to the Local Government Board from time to time but they have no complete information as to the number of cases of deportation. A special inquiry would be necessary to obtain the information desired by the hon. Member, and it is doubtful whether trustworthy statistics would be forthcoming if required for a period of many years. The cost of deportation is borne by the union from which the pauper is deported, and the Local Government Board therefore have no information as to what the average cost may be.

Deportation of Paupers to and from Belfast.

MR. J. DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the system under which paupers who have not acquired a settlement in any particular union in Great Britain are removed to the union to which they originally belonged; whether he is aware that, under this system, poor persons are removed from English and Scottish unions to the Belfast Workhouse, at the rate of one per week, whereas poor persons in the Belfast Workhouse belonging to other unions cannot be removed at the expense of the rates; whether repeated expressions of opinion as to the injustice of this system have been put on record by the Belfast Guardians, in common with other Irish Poor Law Boards; and whether he will consider the advisability of introducing legislation to remove this burden upon Irish ratepayers.

MR. BIRRELL: I would refer the hon. Member to my Answer to the somewhat similar Question put by the hon. Member for Mid Tyrone on 20th May, when I stated that the subject of the Question will receive the careful consideration of the Irish Government in connection with the proposed Bill for amending the Irish Poor Laws which it is hoped to introduce next year.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Do the Government intend to introduce my Bill dealing with the whole question of Poor Law reform for Ireland?

MR. BIRRELL: I have no doubt the hon. Member's Bill will afford us much assistance in dealing with the question.

Women and the King's Scholarships Examination.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, of the 389 women who passed in the first division at the last King's Scholarship examination, how many were monitors and pupil-teachers; how many vacancies will there be for women in the training colleges next course; and will he request the Commissioners of National Education to give a preference to those monitors and pupil-teachers.

MR. BIRRELL: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the number of female monitors and pupil-teachers who passed in the first division at the last King's Scholarship examination was 207. The minimum number of vacancies for women students in the training colleges next session will be 366, but of these a proportion (to be decided by the authorities of each college) will be given to certificated teachers entering for a one year's course. The selection of students from among the qualified candidates rests with the authorities of the respective colleges. In the case of Marlborough Street Training College, which is under the Commissioners' management, the rule is that the candidates are chosen in order of merit. Monitors and pupil-teachers are awarded service marks which are added to the total marks obtained at the examinations in their final year, and they thus obtain an advantage over other candidates for admission to training.

Queen's Colleges, Ireland—Status of Professors.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the present professors in the three Queen's Colleges, Ireland, are civil servants, and as such eligible for pensions payable out of the Consolidated Fund under a modern Superannuation Act; and have any professors of these colleges, when retired, received their pensions hitherto out of the Consolidated Fund or out of moneys voted by Parliament.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: Professors at present serving in the three Queen's Colleges, Ireland, who hold their appointments under Royal Warrant and who are required to give their whole time to their professional duties are deemed to be persons serving in an established capacity in the permanent Civil Service of the State within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1859, and as such, subject to the conditions laid down under the Superannuation Acts, entitled to pension under that Act. Pensions granted under the Superannuation Act, 1859, are not charged directly on the Consolidated Fund, but are subject to the Vote of Parliament, and all pensions which have been granted to retired professors of the college in question have been paid, and where still payable continue to be paid, out of moneys provided by Parliament.

Captain CRAIG: If the pension were payable here out of money provided by Parliament or out of the Consolidated Fund, would it set free a sufficient amount of money to pay for the Endowed Denominational Higher Education Bill now before the Committee upstairs?

Mr. T. M. HEALY: Will the hon. and gallant Member explain the meaning of that Question?

Captain CRAIG: I will do so privately to the hon. Member.

Irish Congested Districts Board.

Mr. DILLON asked if the Congested Districts Board had sent out notice stopping works, although this was the season when they could best be carried on. Was it not probable that this stoppage of work would cause great discontent on the West Coast, and what steps did the right hon. Gentleman propose to take to deal with the situation?

Mr. BIRRELL said he had telegraphed to the Board for information but had not yet received a reply. The question was no doubt an important one, and he had been in communication with the Treasury on it.

Strangford Bar Whistling Buoy.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the whistling buoy the Irish Lights Commissioners have decided to place at Strangford Bar, County Down, is yet in position; and, if not, can he promise that it will be moored before the autumn, when rough weather is generally experienced in that locality.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Board of Trade have not yet given their statutory sanction to the expenditure for this work, and I am in communication with the Advisory Committee on New Lighthouse Works in regard to it. I am afraid, however, it will not be possible for such a buoy to be placed in position before the autumn.

Captain CRAIG: This has been going on a long time. Surely it does not take two years to supply a whistling buoy?

Mr. CHURCHILL was understood to say it would be provided as soon as possible.

The Autumn Sitting of Parliament.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, for the convenience of those Members of this House whose homes are at a distance, he can state on what day he proposes the House should rise for the autumn recess and on what day it should meet for the winter session.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I am not yet in a position to make a definite statement on this matter.

Wholesale Wine and Spirit Merchants' Licences.

MR. McARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is intended by Clause 21 of the Licensing Bill that all wholesale wine and spirit merchants shall be obliged to make application to the justices for a licence to carry on their business, in lieu of obtaining a licence direct from the Excise authorities, which is their only obligation at the present time.

MR. ASQUITH: There is no wine dealers' licence for sale by wholesale only. A justice's licence will therefore under the provisions of Clause 21 be required before an Excise licence to deal in wines can be obtained, in view of the permission to engage in retail trade given by that licence. The spirit dealer's licence on the other hand covers wholesale trade only and therefore does not come within the provisions of the clause.

Franchise Reform.

MR. J. DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is in a position to state when the Government Bill for the reform of the franchise will be introduced.

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir.

Old-age Pensions Bill.

MR. W. R. REA (Scarborough) asked if the Prime Minister was willing to recommit the Old-age Pensions Bill on Monday.

MR. ASQUITH said he was willing to move to recommit the Bill in respect of the schedule and also in respect of the disqualification on account of the receipt of parochial or other relief, on Monday, about eight o'clock. In order to avoid the abrupt termination of the debate, he proposed to suspend the eleven o'clock rule, but he presumed there was a general agreement that the scope of the debate should not be extended beyond the points indicated.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London), asking for information as to next week's business, inquired especially whether then, or in some subsequent week an opportunity would be given for discussion on the Army Estimates for the Special Reserve, a matter of very great importance, on which the House of Commons had really had no opportunity of raising questions on the policy of the Government. Referring to the Prime Minister's earlier statement as to the recommittal of the Old-age Pensions Bill, he intimated that he was unconscious of any bargain or arrangement on this matter, and he imagined that the House would take its own course as to the manner in which it would use its time.

MR. ASQUITH, in repeating the arrangements for Monday, agreed that there was no question of a bargain, but he must plainly state that if there was any disposition shown to extend the scope of the discussion on the recommittal of the Old-age Pensions Bill he would have to reconsider whether he should propose the Motion at all. On Tuesday he would take the Report Stage of the Old-age Pensions Bill, and, in order to leave an interval between Report and Third Reading, take the latter on Thursday, instead of Supply, which would be taken on Wednesday, the Navy Estimates being put down. Vote 5 would be taken first, then Vote 14, and afterwards, if time permitted, Votes 13 and 15, the remainder of the sitting being devoted to the Scottish Estimates—the Fishery Board and the Local Government Board Votes. On Friday would be taken the Motion customary at that time of the session relating to the sitting of the House after eleven o'clock, and afterwards unless an arrangement was arrived at in the interval with regard to the Report stage of the Irish Universities Bill, a Procedure Resolution relating to that measure. He would consider the suggestion as to Army Supply, although four days had already been given to it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR pointed out that they were broken days.

MR. ASQUITH: I will, of course, look into the question.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) asked if it was intended that there should be no longer interval between the recommittal of the Old-age Pensions Bill and the Report than the time between the close of Monday's sitting and the sitting of Tuesday.

MR. ASQUITH: Yes, Sir, that is the case.

MR. WEIR expressed a hope that the Secretary of Scotland would be granted time to deal with questions other than these relating to Vatersay which occupied practically the whole of the sitting devoted to Scottish Estimates

MR. ASQUITH said he believed the general desire was that he should put down the Vote for the Fishery Board first.

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [LORDS], POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [LORDS], AND STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [LORDS].

Ordered, "That so much of the Lords Message of 1st July as relates to the time and place of meeting of the Joint Committee on the Companies (Consolidation) Bill [Lords], Post Office Consolidation Bill [Lords], and Statute Law Revision Bill [Lords], be now considered."—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

Lords Message considered accordingly.

Ordered, "That the Committee of this House do meet the Lords Committee as proposed by their Lordships."

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.—(*Mr. J. A. Pease.*)

CHILDREN BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee B.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 207.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 207.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 291.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Access to Mountains Bill): Sir William Anson; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Viscount Helmsley.

Report to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILLS.

TEACHERS OF MUSIC REGISTRATION BILL.

"To provide for the Registration of Teachers of Music," presented by Mr. O'Neill; supported by Sir John Brunner, Sir Henry Craik, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, and Sir George White; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 292.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

"To further amend the Law relating to Local Government in Ireland; and for other purposes connected therewith," presented by Mr. Birrell; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 293.]

SUPPLY [14TH ALLOTTED DAY.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, AND SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1908-1909.

CLASS IV.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £114,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland."

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.) said that in rising to propose the reduction in the Vote for Irish primary education which stood in his name upon the Paper, he did not think it necessary to cover the general ground that had so often and so well been covered before on this question. The defects of primary education threatened, he feared, to become a stock subject of debate on the Irish Estimates. He could imagine no worse fate for any good cause, for it was very frequently the case that the oftener a subject was talked about in the House the less attention was paid to it, and the more it was misunderstood. Hon. Members had heard so much of this on previous occasions that the moment it was mentioned now they flew elsewhere, leaving the Solicitor-General to bear the burden practically alone. He did not, however, blame the English and Scottish Members for not taking an interest in Irish primary education. It was no concern of theirs. They had not to pay for it, their people had not to suffer under it, and they had no incentive towards seeking to have its condition improved. That, however, was not the case with the Nationalist Members, and they were there to raise the question once again, in spite of the discouragement of an indifferent House of Commons, an irresponsible Board of Education, and a hostile Treasury. He did not propose to cover the general ground that had so often been gone over. To those who took an interest in it a general statement of the case was hardly necessary, because they were already familiar with it. For those who did not take that interest it was still more unnecessary, because it would be merely waste of time. He would, therefore, content himself with a brief survey of the main points with which they had to deal. Their complaints as formulated up to last year, against the condition of primary education in Ireland, might be classified under three heads, the first concerning the school teachers, the second concerning the school buildings, and the third concerning the school programmes. Concerning the teachers, they had pointed out for many years that compared with similar classes of teachers in England and Scotland, they were scandalously underpaid. They were unduly subject to dismissal, and they were unfairly deprived of the ordinary right of citizens. With regard to the school buildings, they had pointed out that the condition of a very large number of primary schools had been for long a disgrace to any civilised authority, ill-ventilated, unheated, providing totally insufficient accommodation, and very often in a shocking state of disrepair. With regard to the school programme, the foremost of their complaints had to do with the treatment of the Irish language, and the attempt which was made to strangle it as soon as it had acquired a foothold in the schools. The first question he proposed to consider was how far their complaints under these three heads had been met by the Government. He was glad to be able at the outset to acknowledge that under each of the three heads there had been an important improvement. There had been a distinct advance along the lines they wished to see followed, and the realisation of some part at least of those reforms which they had so long and so earnestly pressed upon the attention of the right hon. Gentleman. He did not want it to be understood for a moment that they were satisfied with the progress that had been made under any one of these heads. They had asked for simple justice, and had merely received an instalment. It was only right and fair and reasonable to acknowledge that where others had failed the present Chief Secretary had succeeded in improving the conditions under which primary education in Ireland was being carried on. For instance, the right hon. Gentleman had restored the fees for the teaching of the Irish language which were withdrawn by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin. Under the head of school buildings he had procured an additional grant of £40,000 a year for three years. Under the first head, that of school teachers, he had secured a new grant, an addition of £114,000 a year to the salaries. He was not going to enlarge upon the virtues of the right hon. Gentleman as revealed by these facts. He contented himself with placing them upon record. He was glad to be able for a brief moment before plunging into the criticism which it was absolutely necessary to make even with regard to the virtues of the right hon. Gentleman to acknowledge what the right hon. Gentleman had done in this direction. The question he wanted to draw attention to was that of the salaries of the teachers in the National schools. In March of last year the present Secretary took upon himself the *rôle* of prophet and said—

> "I am afraid, although I shall continue to press the case for an increase in the pay of the teachers as strongly as I can, and although I expect to get a contribution towards that object, it will not be on a scale which will give satisfaction to hon. Gentlemen opposite."

The Chief Secretary was right. He had secured an increase of £114,000, but it would be no news to him that not only the amount of this increase but its allocation would cause something more than dissatisfaction. Dismay was the only word that could properly describe the effect which this proposal had had amongst the teachers, particularly amongst the very large number of them who had been absolutely deprived of all benefit under the proposal. The demand of the teachers and of the National Board was for an increase amounting altogether to somewhere about £400,000. Of course they were told that Ireland was a poorer country than England, and that wages ought to be lower; and they were reminded that the schools were smaller, proportionately very much more numerous, and therefore more costly. But in this as in most other matters the British Government had reduced discrimination against Irish interests to the point of a fine art. All that was required by any standard of comparison before it was set up by the Government was that it must tell against Irish interests. For instance, on the basis of population, when Ireland was being enormously under-represented in that House they were told that population was not a proper basis for representation; but as soon as the population test began to tell against Ireland they were told it was the only sound principle. Then when it was shown that according to the taxable capacity of Ireland they were being overtaxed to the extent of nearly £3,000,000 a year they were reminded that expenditure was the proper test, and not taxable capacity, to apply in the case of Ireland. In this case the population basis would tell in favour of the teachers and of an increase in their salaries. Therefore, it was not to be entertained. Likewise, if they turned to all the ordinary bases of comparison such as average attendance, the number on the school rolls and similar tests, they found that the one which was inevitably acted upon by the Treasury and by the Government was that which told most against the interests of the teachers and of education in Ireland. With regard to the increase of £114,000 the same criticism applied. It was the least possible increase that could be given, allocated in the worst possible manner. £14,000 of this sum was to go to teachers in schools having an average attendance of, at least, seventy, and the remaining £100,000 to teachers in schools having an average attendance of not less than thirty-five. The provision that no teacher under the National Board in Ireland was to have any share or part of this increase unless his school had an average attendance of thirty-five was of so extraordinary a character that he could hardly realise or believe that it had been seriously put forward. If there was to be a serious attempt to stick to it on the part of the Government he would tell the right hon. Gentleman frankly and at once that far from allaying the present discontent, far from remedying the present injustice, the proposal would accentuate both in the highest degree, and create an agitation of new and exceptional violence. It could not be otherwise when it was seen that this provision about an average attendance of thirty-five meant the absolute exclusion of 2,867 teachers from any share in this increase of salary. When it was remembered that these 2,867 teachers in the small schools were those who were most urgently in need of some increase in their salaries because in most cases at present they had not even a living wage, the cruelty and the meanness of the provision stood out in the strongest light. He did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman himself could approve of this contemptible action. He did not believe that even the National Board could approve of it, and he believed that neither he nor they were responsible for it. He ventured to assert that as usual it was the ugly hand of the Treasury that had deprived this concession of its good effect by committing this horrible injustice on the teachers of the small schools. £20,000 more, a mere bagatelle compared with what they were entitled to, would have brought them under the benefits of this increase and avoided the creation of an intolerable situation which could not possibly be allowed to continue. The Committee would wait with interest to hear what explanation the right hon. Gentleman had to give of this business — how it was that he consented to such a proposal. Even if he failed to secure the necessary £20,000 that would have provided these 2,867 teachers with the increased salary, if the Treasury defeated him in his efforts to get that, surely it was his duty and the duty of the National Board to see that the £114,000 was so divided that no teacher would be excluded from a share of the grant. That at least was not an unreasonable attitude. But of this the right hon. Gentleman might rest assured, that the present arrangement could not be allowed to stand. Speaking on behalf of his colleagues he told him that they were not going to abandon the teachers of the small schools in Ireland to the rapacity of the British Treasury. The development of the small schools had been part of the settled policy of the National Board in the past. Through its power of the purse the Treasury had interfered more than once in the most flagrant manner with questions of educational policy altogether outside its province, and threatened now to push its prerogative to an altogether unconstitutional extent. They resented very strongly its action in this matter, and they would resist it resolutely to the end, for they could not and would not allow the question to rest until justice was done to those unfortunate people. The whole business illustrated very forcibly the utter hopelessness of this country ever being able to handle Irish affairs effectively or efficiently. They demanded an increase of salary for their ill-paid teachers. They gave them an increase of £114,000, but they did it in such a way as to accentuate instead of to remove existing grievances and injustices. The fact was, of course, that do what they would, they could not govern Ireland successfully from Westminster. The Chief Secretary would no doubt inform them when he rose to speak that he tried his best to get the £20,000 for the teachers of the small schools, but that the Treasury told him that it had no money. No money! That was always the cry, and yet they were going now to spend £700,000 or £1,000,000 a year in Ireland on old-age pensions, without even asking them if they wanted it, merely because it suited English policy, and without any thought or concern as to whether they in Ireland could put that huge amount to better advantage in some other direction. He had, in what he had said, confined himself mainly to the one question of salaries, because he thought that at this moment to introduce other matters might tend to obscure that important issue. When all was said and done, the question of salaries was one of vital importance, because the efficiency of education depended largely upon the teachers, and the efficiency of the teachers depended largely upon their salaries. They wanted to attract the best material they could to the profession. They wanted to level up the standard of teaching. To do so was all the more important now that there was a reasonable hope of University facilities being extended to a large section of the Irish people who had hitherto been excluded from its benefits. However he might have failed in other directions, it looked as if it were in the sphere of education that the right hon. Gentleman would leave behind him the most lasting memorials of his rule in Ireland. As an educationist of distinction, the knowledge of that fact must be some satisfaction for the trials and difficulties of his position, but it ought all the more to impel him to leave no effort unmade to strengthen the foundations on which the work he had done for Irish education rested. He urged him in this matter with all the earnestness at his command to do his utmost to remove without delay an injustice which, if allowed to go on, could not fail to impair and might imperil the future of Irish primary education. He begged to move the reduction standing in his name.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £113,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Hazleton*).

MR. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) said he desired to second the Motion which had been moved in such an eloquent and clear manner by the hon. Member for Galway. He had had a close connection with primary education, and there were some points he wished to put to the right hon. Gentleman in order to elicit a clear and definite statement, not only on the Supplementary Estimate, but on the entire question of primary education in Ireland. The debate was wisely and properly to be confined to a discussion in the first instance of the amount and distribution of the Supplementary Estimate, but there were other issues and other matters in connection with primary education upon which it would be well that the right hon. Gentleman should express his views and opinions. No harm would be done by recalling to the Committee what had happened in Ireland during the last few years. The Chief Secretary had broken the record, and attended a meeting in Ireland at which he delivered a speech that raised the expectations, not only of the teachers, but also of everybody connected with education in Ireland. They were all gratified with what he said in that speech, and they trusted him; and if they had been disappointed it certainly was not his desire to throw the blame upon the right hon. Gentleman. To a large extent he regarded the Chief Secretary as a strong man struggling with fate, and he would not be surprised if his mind was not something of a congested district in regard to Ireland. The question of primary education was one upon which the right hon. Gentleman's views were expressed most definitely and clearly, and they had the greatest possible hope at the time in regard to his future action. They had moved to reduce this Vote merely as a formality, because if they had the power their desire would be to increase it by £300,000. The hon. Member for Galway had pointed out that the claim put forward by the teachers was for £400,000 in reference to salaries and improvements in their position. That was also the claim of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland, the body who had charge of primary education, who insisted that £400,000 was required to deal with the urgent grievance of the teachers' salaries and other matters connected with education. To meet this absolute necessity they had been presented by the Treasury with an Estimate of £114,000. The distribution of that sum was a matter about which there was likely to be serious dissatisfaction in Ireland, and it was most desirable that attention should be called to the fact that while not only were the representatives of Ireland, but also the Commissioners of Education, and, he hoped, the Chief Secretary himself, of one way of thinking as to the amount of the grant and as to the distribution of it, the Secretary to the Treasury, or the Treasury themselves, stepped in and over-rode the opinions and the representations of everybody connected with Ireland in the matter. That was a disgraceful condition of affairs, and it represented how hopeless and disgusting was the condition in matters of education, as in other matters, when they came to be discussed before the House. The hon. Gentleman who represented the Treasury knew nothing whatever about primary education in Ireland, and his predecessor was in the same position. When a Question was asked, the hon. Gentleman said that the Treasury had so decided the matter against the wishes and opinions of everybody in Ireland. That was a condition of affairs which the Chief Secretary should not allow to continue. The greatest dissatisfaction existed in Ireland in reference to the exclusion of 2,860 teachers of small schools from the proposed distribution of the Supplementary Estimate. The small schools had been created and the teachers put in them by the policy which was carried on in Ireland by the Commissioners of Education and the Irish Government, and it certainly could not be in reason for the Treasury or anybody else who undertook the government of Ireland to say that these teachers should now be left out in the cold and receive no share of the money that was being distributed in Ireland in connection with education. The difficulty he was in in discussing the matter was this. He observed that in the Vote for public education there were two subheads, E and H, under which certain money was voted for certain schools in Ireland. The two sums added together, there was a difference of £20,320 of increase over last year's expenditure for dealing with schools the average attendance of which had been between twenty and thirty. That kind of school would practically cover all the excluded schools, and the sum he had mentioned was exactly the difference between what would be necessary to include in the distribution all the excluded teachers. It was rather difficult for the Irish Members to discuss this question without knowing exactly whether that £20,320 was meant for the excluded teachers, and whether, if it was given, it would be equal compensation to them for the other sum to be distributed among the remaining teachers in Ireland. Perhaps the Chief Secretary would indicate in some way whether he was right in thinking——

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): Will the hon. Gentleman allow me to call his attention to the sum in Estimate E, where there is an increase of £26,260?

MR. J. MURPHY said that was the increase under Subhead E, but there was a decrease of £6,000 under Subhead H, and of course when both were taken together there was an increase of £20,260.

MR. BIRRELL said he was afraid the £26,260 represented simply the normal increase in the capitation fees paid to teachers under the existing regulations, and that it would not in any way be free to make up the deficiency from which the excluded teachers would suffer.

MR. J. MURPHY said that that statement enabled him and his friends to know where they were. It showed that a substantial number in Ireland were to be excluded. That was a most unsatisfactory condition of affairs. These small schools existed in every part of Ireland. He knew one in the Gap of Dunloe which was placed there for the advantage of a limited number of children, the average attendance of whom could not possibly come up. It was a question there of having a small school or no school at all. That case was similar to many in nearly all the other parts of Ireland. Most of these small schools were schools which could not be amalgamated, and therefore the teachers in them would have a hopeless existence if they were now to be told, as they were told by the present distribution of the Supplementary Estimate, that they could hope for nothing in the way of the betterment of their salaries and their position generally. What the representatives of Ireland should demand to-day was not a distribution of £114,000 among all the schools of Ireland, but that the right hon. Gentleman should insist on the Treasury giving the remaining £20,000 necessary to deal with all the teachers in a similar manner. It ought to be in the power of the right hon. Gentleman to tackle the question and to bring the Treasury to recognise that Ireland had that claim, and to deal with it justly and properly. It was a question of the greatest concern to a vast number of the poorest people in Ireland. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see that Ireland got this £20,000 for the purpose of the present Estimate. If he was able to get it one of the difficulties of the situation would be overcome. They would have an opportunity of having every class in Ireland receiving the same benefit under the present Supplementary Estimate, and while, of course, all the Members from Ireland would be in agreement that it was not sufficient or so large as it ought to be, and while it would not prevent them from asking more, it would certainly give them the feeling that a first instalment of justice had been done, and the teaching body in Ireland would recognise that nobody was about to be excluded. Supposing the right hon. Gentleman allowed the Treasury to maintain their present attitude as to the distribution of the money, what was going to be the result? There would be 3,000 discontented teachers in Ireland, forming a third of the entire body. These teachers would be in a condition of unrest, and they would have behind them the entire sympathy of the Irish representatives, and a storm would be raised over the matter which would destroy the good which was being done by the right hon. Gentleman in obtaining the grant for other sections of people. All parties in Ireland and all the representatives of Ireland in this House were unanimous on this matter. The last meeting which he addressed in regard to primary education was presided over by a Catholic bishop, and a resolution was moved by a Presbyterian minister, seconded by a Methodist, and supported by people of all political and social conditions in Ireland. Surely if they presented a case of that description to the right hon. Gentleman and his Government, and if they could say without fear of contradiction that the distribution suggested by the Treasury would go against the opinions and the feelings of all these classes in Ireland, and the necessary changes were not made, it became a hopeless task to discuss any question in the House. He believed that the intentions and the efforts of the right hon. Gentleman were well-directed in most matters connected with Ireland, and he appealed to him to do something in connection with this question which would remove the feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction and place the distribution on an equitable basis. He wanted to know how the assistant teachers in Irish schools, of whom there were a large number, were to be affected by the distribution. It was really not quite clear what was intended to be done with them. As the distribution stood at present it would appear as if the teachers of large schools were not only to get bonuses but capitation grants into the bargain. He wished to get an explanation from the right hon. Gentleman of the proposal in both those respects. By doing so the right hon. Gentleman would put at rest the doubts and suspicions of a large number of people in Ireland. The question of teachers in small schools and of assistant teachers was of great importance to about 13,000 people in Ireland, and, therefore, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would make quite clear what he proposed to do in carrying out the distribution of the increased grant. Turning to the question of primary education in Ireland, he believed that the Irish Party had not receded one single bit from their attitude in reference to the constitution, administration, and the whole position of primary education, notwithstanding anything that had happened since the subject was last discussed by the House of Commons. Speaking for himself and for a large body in Ireland they felt that the constitution of the Irish Education Commission was not only wrong but unrepresentative, and they desired as much as ever that it should be changed into something like a representative and intelligent authority. They could never have a sensible and proper system of primary education in Ireland so long as the Board was constituted of men who were past their prime and capacity. He had a special complaint against the Chief Secretary. During the past year there was a vacancy on the Board. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman thought he could do nothing to improve the Board until the opportunity came to sweep it away altogether. However, the Chief Secretary placed upon it General Butler. General Butler had spent all his life in the Army, with, he understood, a very creditable record; but he did not think it was quite the thing for primary education in Ireland that such a gentleman who had spent most of his life abroad in another service, should be brought in, or that he would be in a position to communicate what was necessary in relation to primary education to the Treasury and the Government. He knew perfectly well that General Butler had given many evidences of a keen knowledge of educational matters, and he merely mentioned his name in this connection as an indication of the settled policy of the Government in reference to the constitution of the Commission. He hoped that if another opportunity occurred the Chief Secretary would try another method and endeavour to place on the Commission someone belonging to the new ideas in relation to education in Ireland—someone who understood the present desires of the younger generation and who would be in touch with their wants and requirements—while he was waiting to make a greater change on that body. He believed that one such man could effect many changes of importance in regard to primary education. Questions were arising from day to day which at present there was no opportunity of considering. Dr. Starkie, he understood, was practically the Board on matters of routine and detail. Dr. Starkie had a peculiar reputation in certain sections in Ireland, but when one came in contact with him it was found that he was not so bad as he was painted; and that if a case was put before him he was inclined to give it consideration. But it was not for him, or the Irish representatives, or the unfortunate people of Ireland connected with education to hunt after Dr. Starkie and explain every requirement. The Board ought to be so constituted that the resident officials would be in the position of seeking what was the right thing to do. Let him give a case in point. A rule had been made by the Commission making it practically impossible for a teacher in Ireland to hold a licence. He acknowledged that all Members interested in education believed that that was a right and necessary rule. He himself did not think that teachers ought to seek to obtain a licence in the future. But he thought that it was most unjust for the Commission to make the rule retrospective, and victimise a man who happened to marry a lady who had a public-house, and obtain a licence in that accidental manner, and in consequence of that had his salary kept from him by the Commission for a considerable time. In fact, no appeal which had been made to the Commission in regard to the matter had moved them. That was not an isolated case. There were more people in Ireland who had had licences in their possession in the way he had mentioned, and it was grievously unfair and improper that the Commission should withhold salaries in such cases. There was another point in connection with primary education in Ireland which affected not only the teachers but the children. The question of the maintenance and the methods of cleaning and heating the primary schools in Ireland had been often put before the Chief Secretary and the Commission, and he was personally disappointed that something had not been placed on the Estimates with the object of making the schools clean, warm, and comfortable. The teachers, much as they desired higher salaries—as was the way with ordinary human beings—had always put forward claims for greater assistance in connection with the cleaning and heating of the schools, but these had not been conceded; and so long as they had the power to call attention to this question they would press it forward and insist upon its being dealt with in a proper way by the Treasury. There was no difficulty about the money; there ought to be no difficulty about the money; and really it was annoying to find the President of the Board of Agriculture and the Secretary for Education rushing to the Treasury and other Departments for money to build up voluntary and technical education which would be utterly useless as long as primary education was in its present poor and needy position in Ireland. He put it to the right hon. Gentleman with all the force he could, that he should disregard most other claims dealing with education in Ireland until he had put on a proper, sensible, and well-conducted basis the education of the poor who were the most necessitous in the country from an educational point of view. He put it to the right hon. Gentleman that while he said that he could not control the Education Commission a nod was as good as a wink to many of the officials in Ireland; and if he would nod to Dr. Starkie that when that gentleman was dealing with his inspectors he should induce them to adopt a sympathetic attitude to the teachers instead of the method of continuous fault-finding, it would effect a good deal in the way of smoothing over difficulties and improving the education in the primary schools. The teachers should be able to look upon the inspectors as their friends, who would have regard to their virtues and not always to their faults. He desired to put the question of the supplementary grant in the first place, but the whole question of primary education in Ireland was pressing and urgent, and the settlement of it would be watched with interest. They still remained in regard to primary education where they were a year ago. The subject was calling for reform, and the Irish Party were determined to use all their efforts to rouse public opinion until there would be a storm in Ireland that would succeed in obtaining a system of primary education well supplied with money, well constructed, leading the youngsters of Ireland to being properly equipped for their position in life, and giving them such an education as they required, deserved, and had shown themselves capable of benefiting by.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): It will be convenient if at this early stage of the debate I speak as an Irish Unionist representative and for the Irish Unionists. They most cordially and unanimously support the view put forward by the hon. Gentleman who has spoken with regard to the new grant of £114,000. With all the criticisms of the hon. Gentleman it must be understood I do not altogether agree. I have had the honour of holding the office of Chief Secretary for Ireland for some time and was brought into close contact with Dr. Starkie and the National Education Board; and I have seen a good deal of Dr. Starkie and his colleagues. Of course it is very easy to criticise any body of public men, whatever their duties and functions may be; but I think it would be well if all public bodies discharged their functions as efficiently as the Irish Board of Education. Dr. Starkie is, in my opinion, one of the most earnest and devoted servants of education to be found in this or any other country. I regret that a cause so important as this should have been brought forward in a House which does not appear to be very interested in what is going on. I cannot help noticing that there are a wonderful number of seats vacant on the benches opposite. I know that one of the causes of the absence of some Members of Parliament on this occasion is that they cannot serve on Grand Committee all day and come here also in the afternoon, and therefore we have a thin House to discuss a question of vital importance. The hon. Members below the gangway are very kind. So far does their kindness carry them that they will do what I should have thought hardly any supporter of the Government would do. They will break the Government up into compartments and seek to draw distinctions between the Irish administration and the Treasury.

MR. J. MURPHY said the right hon. Gentleman was stating the exactly reverse position to that on which he insisted, namely, that the Treasury and the Irish Government were the same.

MR. WALTER LONG: The mover of the Motion stated that this was not the Chief Secretary, but the horrible hands of the Treasury again, and that they knew the right hon. Gentleman would do everything that he could. I cannot take that view. The Government must be regarded as a whole. It is impossible to shelter the Irish administration behind the Treasury. With regard to the old controversy between the Irish administration and the Treasury this is not the first time by many that it has been raised, and no doubt we shall hear more of it in years to come. But I hold very strongly that it is the duty and function of the Treasury to decide what money shall be allocated to the different parts of the United Kingdom for different purposes, but that when it comes to the distribution of that money in the countries concerned, the Treasury have no right to speak upon that matter. I earnestly beg the Chief Secretary, who has the reputation of being a strong man, to take this occasion to assert his right as head of the Irish administration to take the money allotted by the Treasury and make the most of it, and to get more if he can. This is not one of those occasions of which it has been said that all the Irishmen are agreed for the moment because they are going to get more money out of the Treasury. That is not the reason for the agreement between the Irish Unionists and Nationalists on this occasion. Our reason is that not only do you fail to do good by the change that you are making in the system of education, but that you may do very great harm. I am astounded when I find the sum is put at another £20,000. The Estimate that was shown to me was rather larger, but we may take it that £20,000 would cover the difference in regard to these small schools. It is, therefore, inconceivable that when you have made up your mind to give a grant of £114,000 you should spoil your whole scheme for £20,000. Assume that the object of this change is to bring about a reform which in the opinion of every educationist in every part of the United Kingdom is a wise reform. If it be possible to secure so far as you can the amalgamation of small schools you secure economy and educational improvement. But in the Irish case this reform is an impossible one for two reasons. First you have the religious difficulty, which makes amalgamation impossible, and then you have the still greater difficulty—a difficulty which is insuperable—that in some parts of Ireland, notably in the South and West, the schools which come below the average attendance of thirty-five are the small schools in the scattered districts in which the children cannot come to them except under conditions which would make school attendance absolute cruelty. But even supposing that it were possible and advisable, I protest against this way of doing it. If it is believed by the powers that be that amalgamation of schools is necessary, by all means amalgamate them, but do it in the right way. If you cannot do it without punishing somebody, punish the right people. Here you are doing it in the wrong way and punishing the wrong people. You are not seeking to give special advantages to any amalgamation by way of examination. Your amalgamation should be carried out with advantage to the schools concerned, but you are seeking to do it by punishing these small schools who have nothing to do with it and who by their own energy, ability, and industry have done much to make up the shortcomings of the system. Yet the teachers of these schools, the most unselfish and most devoted class in the whole of the land, are the people you are punishing for the sake of £20,000. We are told that out of the 13,000 national school teachers some 3,000 will be affected. In Connaught there are 1,418 National schools, and 607 of these will be excluded from the benefits of the new capitation grant, the average attendance in them being 26·7 and the total number of children attending no less than 16,257. It is almost incredible that for the sake of £20,000 or £30,000 you are going to inflict an injury so grave on the younger generation of the Irish people. It is sometimes said that Ireland ought to contribute more to the cost of education and that the cost is larger in proportion to other parts of the country, but there are difficulties existing there which create an inevitable necessity for a larger number of schools than exists elsewhere. I do not think that against either of the churches in Ireland the charge can be made that they have not put their hands into their pockets and paid generously for the provision of educational facilities. Surely you are not going to spoil the generosity of a grant like this by making it fall so much below the necessary amount as to do harm where harm will be most felt and where the people are the least able to protect themselves. I welcome the increased grants as an improvement in the condition of the teachers in the larger schools, but they are the strongest of the teaching body and best able to defend their own rights. The teachers in the smaller schools are the weaker members of the community, least able to defend themselves, yet they are the victims selected for this treatment. It is not because we are united for the purpose of making a joint raid upon the public purse that we ask the Government to reconsider their policy. I do not know who in Ireland would be found to approve of this change. I am sure the National Commissioners have done their best to prevent it. No education authority in Ireland approves of drawing this unusual and unmerited distinction between the two classes of teachers, and in regard to the children there can be but one opinion. I am informed that if the change is insisted upon it will result in the destruction of some of the smaller schools. I do not know whether efforts can or would be made to preserve them. I am assured that there is great risk of some of them being overwhelmed. We are entitled to ask the Government what is their policy in the event of this result following from the alteration in the grant. In England and Scotland if you destroy by legislation or administration the voluntary schools, you have a substitute ready to hand, and machinery to provide schools at the cost of the public, but you have no system of that kind in Ireland. If the benches opposite had been fuller, if the majority of the Members of the House were present, to whatever party or creed they belonged or whatever views they had upon denominational education, they would be convinced that a gross act of injustice is being done and that every effort should be made and influence brought to bear to induce the Government to change their ground before it is too late. The case is simple in the extreme. There is much to be done for the improvement of the condition of the teachers in national schools; there are heavy arrears to be undertaken in regard to many conditions of elementary schools in Ireland. I admit that everything cannot be done at once, but if you are taking a step forward, if you are really going to do something effective in the cause of education and improving the condition of the teachers, then let your policy be general, let it apply to all concerned, in order that it may leave behind it no rankling feeling of injustice and soreness, and you will have done something not only to help the teachers but the children.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he did not suppose that there was any single phase of Irish government which so completely showed how the country suffered from lack of self-government as the question of education. There was, of course, general agreement that in no country in the world was the subject so much one of national interest, and so carefully watched as in Ireland. Yet it was perfectly true to say that in Ireland the cause of education had suffered probably more than had any other matter concerning the national daily life of the country. He re-echoed the wish of the right hon. Gentleman who just sat down that the Benches opposite had been better filled, for hon. Members would then have seen that there was good reason why the Irish people so passionately desired to be allowed to manage their own affairs, in their own country, and without reference to that House. The voice of Ireland was one upon this matter. The hon. Members for Galway and Kerry represented the Nationalist Members in urging the matter upon the Government, and they had been supported by the right hon. Member for South Dublin, who led the Unionist Party in Ireland. They found that from East and West, North and South of Ireland, Unionists and Nationalists, Catholics and Protestants presented a unanimous case to the Government. It certainly would be most interesting to hear what the reply of the Chief Secretary could possibly be to the demand that had been put forward. They were sometimes told that no matter how well disposed the Government might be, they found it impossible to carry out their good intentions because of the action of the Treasury in refusing to grant sufficient money to carry out what everybody in Ireland believed to be necessary. That might have held good with the Government of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin, but were they to be told that the Treasury which was now under the control of the Liberal Government, the Government which had expressed its entire sympathy with the Irish people in their national demands, was still to pursue the old tradition of denying to the Irish people what was necessary to meet their requirements in a matter so vital as education? He yielded to nobody in his belief that the Chief Secretary and many of his colleagues were deeply in sympathy with the demands of the Irish people, but the right hon. Gentleman must allow him to say, with every possible deference, that the time had really come when the great majority of the people of Ireland would refuse to continue their belief in the sympathy of the present Government unless they saw some practical effect given to it in such a matter as that which they were now discussing. The right hon. Member for South Dublin, had pointed out, in enforcing arguments already used by hon. Members on the National benches, that it was a piece of absurdity for the Government to spoil the entire work, which they proposed to carry out in granting £114,000, by excluding that very class of national teachers who stood most in need of something being done. What did the Chief Secretary think would be the result in Ireland if the present expressed intentions of the Treasury was carried out, and the majority of school teachers received no improvement of their position, while two or three thousand of the poorest and most deserving of national teachers received no increase in their pay as well as no improvement in their position at all? The natural result would be the utmost dissatisfaction from one end of the country to the other. He appealed to the Chief Secretary to set up a precedent Let him stand up at that box and tell the Secretary to the Treasury that this was a matter in which the Department must meet the unanimously expressed desire of the Irish people. They knew that there were differences of opinion as to other matters in which the Treasury was approached daily from Ireland for money—matters relating to the building of labourers' cottages, for the erection of artisans' houses, for forestry, and for numberless other matters; but in this matter of education there was absolutely no difference of opinion whatever in Ireland, and they ought clearly to understand where they were before the discussion was brought to a close. Was the Secretary to the Treasury prepared to get up and say that on this matter, involving some £20,000 extra—it was impossible to give an exact figure, but it had been ascertained that £20,000 would enable the same benefits to be given to all the teachers in Ireland under the improved scheme—the Government would run the risk of causing dissatisfaction and of really spoiling the concession which had been made? Were they to go back to their constituents and say that not merely a Tory Government, but the Liberal Government, the Government which had voted for Home Rule, were determined to penalise two or three thousand of their poorest, most needy, and most deserving national teachers in Ireland, because the Treasury of this great Empire refused to complete the scheme with an additional £20,000 or more? If that was the message with which they were to be sent back to Ireland, nobody could be surprised it there should be a wave of indignation from one end of the country to the other. Though he should personally regret any act of discourtesy towards the Chief Secretary, he very much doubted, if they were sent home with such a message, that the right hon. Gentleman would be again so enthusiastically received as he once was by the national teachers of Ireland. He had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman had done his best in the matter, but he himself should see that the whole force of the Cabinet was brought to his assistance; and he thought, if only as a matter of courtesy, that there should have been more Members of the Cabinet present. The Chief Secretary was not all powerful. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman had to resist influences brought against him; and he knew also that the Chancellor of the Exchequer might claim that at the present time he was engaged in serious work connected with his department. Still, the fact remained that while discussing a question which vitally affected the national well-being of Ireland, there was an entire absence of Members of the Liberal Party, and of every Member of the Cabinet except the Chief Secretary, who had with him the Secretary to the Treasury and one of the Irish Law Officers. [Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE entered the House at this moment.] He was very glad to see that the right hon. Gentleman had come in, because at any rate it added one to the audience of four. The Chancellor of the Exchequer understood this question, he had no doubt, already. But he would make a personal appeal to him to see whether, even at the eleventh hour, it was not possible to make some alteration which would do even-handed justice. He did not wish to ask for any favour in the matter. He did not believe that there was a man in the House of Commons on the other side who denied the fairness and justice of the proposition which they were submitting. The Chancellor of the Exchequer knew that after very many weary years of agitation, after numberless Questions in that House, and debate after debate under numerous Governments, at last they had secured a recognition of the fact that the national teachers in Ireland were a body of public servants extremely underpaid, that in proportion they were paid far worse than the school teachers in England, or Scotland, or Wales. They had secured a recognition of the fact that not only in common justice and fairness to the teachers, but also for the welfare of the children under them, their salaries should be increased, and their position improved to some extent. They got the recognition of their contention that the national teachers ought to be better treated, but everyone knowing the requirements of education would support their claim that £114,000 was inadequate, and even such as it was it did not make provision for any improvement whatever in the condition of 3,000 of the poorest and most deserving of the national teachers. That was not a proposition which could possibly give satisfaction. The schools below thirty-five in average attendance were the most needed schools. They were quite as necessary and useful as the largest attended schools, yet simply because the average was not more than thirty-five, they were to continue to have unjust treatment. They were told it was all because the Government stopped short of an additional grant of £20,000 a year. That was a position which could not be defended. Was the Chancellor of the Exchequer going to allow the Treasury to put their hand to this matter, to make as far as they were willing to go, a complete job of it, and not to benefit one man because he happened to have 50 or 100 scholars, and to leave another man in a state of practical destitution simply because the inhabitants were sparse, and he could not get more than thirty-five scholars? The position could not possibly be defended, and he appealed to the Chief Secretary to do his best. He believed he always did his best, but after all, could they not in these matters sometimes come to the point of insistence? Sometimes in Ireland men were called to task because they used extravagant and violent language. They were told it was unconstitutional and that nothing was to be gained by it. But a situation of this kind was of itself, without the addition of any other injustice, sufficient to make people, from one end of the country to the other, rebel. There was no civilised country where such a proposition could be made in reference to education, as was now calmly put forward by the Treasury. The injustice perpetrated on 2,000 or 3,000 of the most deserving men would not be tolerated and it would make the whole task of the Government in every other direction much more difficult. There would undoubtedly be unrest, and whatever benefit there might be in the suggestion of the Government would lose all virtue. The besetting sin of English government towards Ireland was always that when a concession was made to the just and right claims of the people it was never made freely, generously, and ungrudgingly. There was always something which spoilt the good contained in the concession. There they had the same story again. He was grateful for the concession, as far as it went, but it was accompanied by a situation fraught with the greatest injustice to the most deserving class. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to see whether the grant could not be enlarged. The teacher of the small school had to work as hard as the teacher of the large school. Let them not go back to Ireland with this fresh proof of the injustice that was now asked to be put upon the teachers of Ireland by helping a certain class and leaving unhelped the most deserving portion of the whole community. He had written a public letter to the Chief Secretary, but he supposed he made it a rule never to read letters addressed to him. Last winter in bitter weather he had visited many National schools on the borders of Clare and Galway. It was enough to go to any man's heart and soul to see on a wet, chilly day, the poor children in schools without any provision made for the proper heating of the room. In one school, a new one, with good roof and windows and stone walls, there was no fire of a proper kind, and the children, many of whom had walked long miles in the rain and mud, sat there all day practically shivering with their teeth almost chattering. It was hard to find turf anywhere in Ireland last year—the weather was so wet, but in some cases the children had actually brought with them in their poor little arms, sods of turf, which smouldered in the fireplace without any spark or gleam of red fire. One teacher he knew spent the money that he could ill afford in trying to keep the children warm, and the managers of many schools also out of their own resources helped to heat the schools. It was said that this was the greatest Empire the world had ever seen, though he had his doubts about it. Anyhow it was one of the richest. Our fleets were everywhere and our flag flew everywhere. The other day when the French President went to the Opera, £2,000 was spent on decorating the walls of Covent Garden with flowers. The other day an hon. Gentleman wanted to insist that the Union Jack should be unfurled over every school in Ireland and Great Britain. They could hoist what they liked over them so far as he was concerned, but let them keep the life in the blood of the children and light fires in the schools. If they hoisted flags over some of these schools that he knew they would probably try to light the fire with the flag. The report of Mr. Dale, the educational expert, showed that what he said was perfectly true as to the lamentably deficient state of these schools in regard to heating, lighting, and sanitary arrangements. It was not a large point, but it went very near the life of the people. The Chancellor of the Exchequer occupied one of the greatest positions of the Empire, which he had won by his ability, and those who had seen his career, admired the way in which he had come to the front by his own unaided efforts. But with all that, what he admired most about him was that in his great position he retained a vivid recollection of his days in the Welsh land that he came from when he was, perhaps, a more or less poor boy there, and he knew what the poor had to suffer. He appealed to him in Heaven's name, whatever might be left undone, to see to it that next winter every school in Ireland was from a sanitary point of view put in order and had a good fire. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer did this, his name would be regarded with deep respect in Ireland, and they would say that there was at last at the head of the British Treasury a man who in the midst of all his great work had a heart to feel for the sufferings, the requirements, and the needs of the little ones who went barefooted along the road in order to get that knowledge which their parents were anxious they should have. He felt very strongly upon this point because he had investigated the matter for himself. In a letter which he wrote to the *Freeman's Journal* he invited the Chief Secretary to deal with the matter and he asked the Government to see that next winter, at any rate, this state of things should be rectified, and that in future the schools of Ireland were properly ventilated and put into a proper sanitary condition. If this were done it would have the effect of benefiting the children, enabling them to learn more, and it would also make the burden of the national teachers of Ireland much lighter.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) said he desired to raise his voice in support of what had been said upon this question. The small schools referred to had been created and maintained as the result of the express legislation of that House. In 1892, after a protracted struggle between successive Governments, the different religious denominations in Ireland held out for denominational education of the strictest kind, although temptations on the basis of undenominational schools were offered. In the end the Government felt overcome by the universal opposition, and recognised that the only system upon which primary education could be run in Ireland was on strictly denominational lines. The necessary consequence of that policy was the springing up of small schools containing on an average of anything from twenty to forty pupils. Anyone who knew anything of the state of Ireland, particularly in the west and south, and many counties in the north, must recognise the fact that there were many places in which the members of a particular religious denomination could not get within a radius of three or four miles more than about twenty or thirty children to attend a particular school. If they closed up that school or did anything that would render it impossible to carry it on, inevitably they would leave those twenty or thirty children without any provision for education, or else they would compel them against the express wishes of their parents and the approved policy of Parliament to attend schools under a different religious management and of a different persuasion altogether from that in which their parents believed. Accordingly in many parts of the North there were schools under Roman Catholic management where the entire children within three or four miles of the school did not exceed anything from ten to thirty. On the other hand, in the West of Ireland there were small isolated communities of Protestants, and the same in the South, where they found it impossible if those schools were to be conducted under teachers and managers of a different religious persuasion to run them with any prospect of getting more than twenty to forty pupils. Parliament had recognised this principle and from time to time had held out attractions and inducements to those various religious denominations in Ireland to fall in with the national school system on the understanding and undertaking that Parliament would support and retain those small schools. In the year 1892 there was passed a National Education Bill for Ireland which expressly recognised that a capitation grant was to be provided in schools of an average attendance of 10, and a salary for a teacher was to be provided in schools with an average attendance of 20. From that day under the authority and sanction of Parliament any number of those small schools had been founded in different parts of Ireland where the average attendance was anything between 10 and 40. He did not know who was responsible for the principle upon which the grant of £114,000 had been allocated. They had been told that in the allocation of the grant no teacher was to get any bonus unless there was an average attendance of 70 in his school, and that the extra capitation grant of 5s. a head to each child was to be confined to schools with a minimum attendance of 35. It was self-evident that such an allocation and distribution must do grievous injury and wrong in the very quarters where it would be felt the most, and to the very persons who stood most in need of some benefit. While he agreed that those teachers in schools with an average attendance of 35 or 70 were undoubtedly in an unfavourable position as contrasted with the teachers of England and Scotland, and that undoubtedly they had a claim upon the Treasury for a substantial addition to their salaries, it could not be denied that they were in a stronger position than their poorer brethen who were receiving the salaries of third-class teachers in schools where the attendance was between 10 and 20. It was an extraordinary thing that the principle should be adopted which necessarily excluded from any benefit the very class of people in the very class of schools which stood most in need of help. He had been deluged with remonstrances and complaints because it was evident that the allocation now proposed was a new policy and effected a new departure. Evidently the idea in the mind of the Treasury was that it they were to allocate this grant on the lines proposed in the Estimate, the result necessarily would be the closing of a number of the smaller schools, and in the long run the Treasury would save what they granted this year a few years hence, because by the closing of schools they would save the salaries of a large number of the present teachers. If there was any idea of that kind abroad, or in the mind of the Treasury, he could assure them that it would meet with unanimous opposition from every quarter in Ireland, because if there was one thing more than another that the parents of children in the national schools in Ireland were determined upon, to whatever creed they belonged, it was that those schools should be under the management of persons of the same religion as the parents who sent their children to them, and that the children should have the fullest opportunity for training and teaching in the religion professed by their parents. That had been the idea and the principle of all denominations in Ireland in connection with primary teaching in elementary schools. He quite agreed that the Report referred to by the hon. Member for Clare, made by Professor Dale, showed that a great deal might be done in certain quarters in the way of amalgamation with a view to economy and efficiency. He also agreed that in some towns there was a multiplicity of schools, and a good deal could be saved by reducing the number of schools in some of the larger towns. That, however, was not the complaint they made. What they complained of was the new development in this particular allocation, because it would affect not merely the schools in towns whose average attendance might be below the required figures, but also those in the rural part, including the small schools and the country schools, and they would be most hit. Those were the schools and the portions of Ireland that were least able to stand or submit to such an injustice or inequality. He had had a communication from the Diocesan Board of Education in connection with his own Church in different parts of Ireland, and one and all told him that if this policy was persisted in, if this scheme of allocation was forced upon the people in Ireland, it would raise a storm of indignation and protest, not merely on the part of the teachers who were pecuniarily interested, but on the part of the parents of children and all those religious people who took any interest whatever in primary education in Ireland. While he did not pledge himself to the accuracy of the figures which had been given, yet, if it was a fact that an additional sum of £20,000 would have remedied this injustice and prevented the inequalities in the proposed allocation and distribution, it seemed to him to be absolutely impossible to explain or understand the action of the Treasury or anybody else who might be in the slightest degree responsible for the proposition. If it was the case that an additional sum of £20,000 added to this £114,000 would have enabled the distribution to be made among the teachers of all schools, all he could say was that it seemed to him a more miserable or a more miserly act on the part of the British Treasury it was impossible to conceive. While he was very glad to support the remonstrance made in the interest of the teachers themselves, he warned the right hon. Gentleman that there was a much larger and greater question involved in the matter—not merely that which affected the rights and the *status* of the teachers, but that which affected the rights of the children themselves. He understood that it was the feeling of all sections of people in Ireland that they never would consent to have forced upon them, after fifty years of an opposite policy, by indirect means, a new departure of this kind. The system which had prevailed up to the present was that the parents should have the right to insist that their children should be taught in schools which were under the management and control of members of the religion to which they themselves belonged. He would urge the right hon. Gentleman to consider that if this policy of amalgamation was to be insisted upon and forced upon the country, at least it should be confined to any district in which it was possible for the children of any particular schools which had been closed to get education in an adjoining school under the same management within reasonable distance. There were cases with which hon. Members from Ireland were familiar, where in the west, south, and north of the country it would be impossible to get a school within a radius at all reasonable or acceptable—a similar school and under similar management. It was for these districts and managers that they made the appeal to the right hon. Gentleman. At the same time he did not intend to overlook the present demand of the teachers themselves for justice in this matter. He joined with his colleagues from Ireland in making this appeal to the right hon. Gentleman and the Treasury, asking them not in this small and miserable manner to make a departure which would be opposed to the sentiments of every person in Ireland who took an interest in primary education and was inconsistent with the ordinary elements of justice and fair play due to the unfortunate teachers involved.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.) said he was pleased to observe that when the hon. Member for Kerry said there ought to be no difficulty about money the Chief Secretary cried out "Hear, hear." Evidently from that endorsement of what his hon. friend said the Chief Secretary was not the originator of this parsimonious treatment. The right hon. Gentleman knew well that the Treasury had always treated the demand of the Irish people in respect to education in the same parsimonious spirit. The Commissioners of National Education in Ireland has asked for £400,000 in order to improve the position of the national school teachers of Ireland, and at all events to make them approach the condition of the national school teachers of England and Scotland. The Government had not acceded to the request of the Commissioners of National Education in this respect, any more than they had acceded to the requests in respect of other matters in connection with primary education in Ireland. In their report for the year before last the Commissioners asked that they should have £100,000 per annum for five years in order to bring the schools into a sanitary condition, and last year, after a delay of building and repairing for more than four years, this niggardly Treasury through their mouthpiece the Chief Secretary for Ireland gave £40,000 for three years in order to meet the demands. His hon. friend the Member for East Clare had drawn a picture of the condition of things in the schools of Ireland. It was not the first time that hon. Members from Ireland had harrowed the feelings of sympathetic Members by describing the miserable and insanitary conditions of these schools. It was impossible that the children attending the schools could receive the full benefit of the education the teachers were willing to give them under these miserable conditions, and yet the Treasury, when approached by its own representative in Ireland for the purpose of getting money in order to remedy this state of things, instead of giving £100,000 for five years, gave this miserable £40,000 for three years. How did this compare with the manner in which primary education was dealt with in England? Between 1902 and 1906, as the Estimates showed, the grants for primary education in England increased by no less than 45 per cent., and last year's Estimates contained on the top of that an additional sum of £200,000. Scotland, in the four years 1902–05, received an increase in its educational grants for primary education of no less than 52 per cent., and on the top of that there was an increase last year. During that period of four years the increase for primary education to Ireland was only 1 per cent., and now when the Treasury pocket was opened at last and they recognised the claim of the Irish teachers, what did they give? A miserable £114,000, which was only an increase of 9 per cent. on the amount previously granted. England and Scotland were revelling in luxury in the matter of education grants, while Ireland with its increase of 1 per cent. within the period referred to had meted out to it a further increase of 9 per cent. That was the manner in which Irish demands were met by the Treasury. What was the reflection that was forced upon one's mind by this condition of things? They knew that Ireland was contributing more than its proper share of the revenues of these countries to the extent of between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000 per annum. It was common knowledge that the English Treasury had its hand deep down in the pockets of the Irish nation, and that by the exertions of its officials in the Revenue Departments it had extracted from the pockets of the Irish people this exorbitant overcharge, and when they asked for a return in the cause of education—which after all was the greatest cause of the Empire—it was meted out to them in doles, while the English and the Scottish people were getting all they wanted in that respect. There was a grievance in regard to the way in which Ireland had been treated in respect of educational grants. The grants were based on attendance. The grants made to Ireland before the time of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach in the '70's were made on the basis of her contributions to the Imperial revenue. While that state of things continued Ireland had, as compared with the other countries, not very much reason to complain. Ireland got something like her proper share, but it would never have done to have Ireland in such a favoured condition, and accordingly, agreeing to a suggestion which came from Scotland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach changed the manner of making the grants and placed it upon the basis of attendance and not of contributions to the revenue. From that day to this the manner in which these grants had been made had militated against Ireland in educational matters. That would be to the advantage of Scotland, 75 per cent. of the population of which was urban compared with 25 per cent. in Ireland. He would like to know what would be the effect of this increase of 5s. capitation grant upon the teachers that it would touch. The position revolved round the condition of the teachers, and his submission to the Committee was that their condition was bad all round. That had been recognised for many years. Mr. Bryce on 29th

March, 1906, when admitting that educational matters in Ireland should be looked into, said that their conditon was bad. He said—

> "Let us begin at once with the condition of the teachers and the state of the schools."

The present Chief Secretary when addressing the school teachers of Ireland in conference on 4th April last year, said—

> "Well, now, ladies and gentlemen, I state unhesitatingly that you Irish teachers can invite the most careful examination of your claims, because anyone who has acquaintance with the work you have done must admit that the scale of your salaries is most meagre and insufficient, and that your chances of promotion are not only poor but disheartening."

It would only be necessary to point out to the Committee what was the difference between the position of the national school teachers in Ireland and that of the school teachers in England and Scotland, when the Committee would see what was in the mind of the two last Chief Secretaries when they said that the position of the school teachers of Ireland was bad. The average salary of male teachers in England was £160 3s. 9d.; in Scotland, £179 6s.; in Ireland, £102 19s. 6d. The average salary for female teachers in England was £109 13s. 6d.; in Scotland, £90 6s.; and in Ireland, £82 11s. 9d. The assistant teachers in England had an average salary of £114 per annum; and it would, therefore, be seen that the assistant teachers in England had absolutely been getting a higher rate of salary than the principal school teachers in Ireland. He submitted that that was a state of things that ought not to be allowed to exist, and those figures must have been present in the mind of the Chief Secretary when he made his demand on the Treasury for this miserly grant of £114,000 in order to bring the salaries of the Irish teachers up to a higher figure. He contended that the right hon. Gentleman had not fulfilled the promise made to the teachers last year, and the promise made by Mr. Bryce to the Members of the House. He could go on quoting extracts from the speech of the Chief Secretary. It was a very hearty and sympathetic speech, and one for which the teachers were very grateful and for which they on the Irish Benches were none the less grateful. So much on the subject of the teachers generally. But he must emphasise to some extent all that had been said in respect to the teachers who were eliminated from the benefit of the concession. From an Answer given to a Question put by the hon. Member for East Kerry it appeared that the concession would not affect 2,858 schools in Ireland. That was the number of schools that had an average attendance of less than thirty-five scholars, and necessarily the number of teachers who would not be benefitted would be 2,858, not counting the assistants. Very strong language had been used in regard to this subject by the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University. He had stated at the outset of his speech that the Chief Secretary had cheered the statement of his friend the Member for East Kerry that there ought to be no difficulty about the money.

MR. BIRRELL: What I meant to say was that there is great difficulty about finding the money.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR said that the sense in which his hon. friend used the expression was that there ought to be no difficulty about the money; and then he backed that up by saying that there was no difficulty about the money, and that was cheered by the right hon. Gentleman. The debate, so far as it had gone, ought to strengthen the hands of the Chief Secretary in his demands on the Treasury. He did not need to say, to stiffen his back, because the right hon. Gentleman had a good stiff back, and he had the best intentions and the best goodwill towards the community for the government of which he was responsible. The debate ought, therefore, to help him in any future demand the right hon. Gentleman might make on the Treasury. He was pleased to see that the right hon. Gentleman had a representative of the Treasury beside him, and he hoped that the debate would also have its due effect on that hon. Gentleman. What was the position of the 2,858 teachers who were disqualified from getting any benefit from the concession? They could not rise in the ranks of their profession as could the Scottish and English teachers, who had a larger attendance in their schools. In order to acquire promotion to the first grade of teachers there must be an attendance of at least seventy, or of fifty to be promoted to the second class in the first division. All those teachers in Ireland who had an attendance of thirty-five were disqualified from ever rising to the first division, and were doubly damned because they could not receive the 5s. capitation grant. Their position was, therefore, hopeless. What incentive had these men to improve themselves? With no hope of promotion, they would not study. What incentive had they to teach the children carefully when they had no prospect of reward? Therefore, the Government as a whole, by their conduct, seemed to indicate that they did not care three straws for the children of Ireland, or whether they were taught well or ill. Sixty per cent, of the schools of Ireland had an attendance of under fifty, and their teachers, therefore, could not aspire to any higher position, while their assistants had no incentive to improve themselves or give a better education to the children. What was to be done for the assistant teachers of Ireland? They were still poorer, and had even smaller salaries than teachers of the third grade, and those teachers whose school attendance was under thirty-five. The rule seemed to be: "The poorer you are, the less you will get; those who have least get less, and those who have much will have more." So long as those schools were allowed to exist, no matter how small they were, the teachers ought to be adequately rewarded and not treated worse than an ordinary labourer. When a labourer was dismissed he could go elsewhere for work, but there was nothing done to encourage good men to enter the teaching profession. In the case of 60 per cent. of the teachers of Ireland there was nothing before them; they were condemned to remain in the same position the whole of their lives. He, therefore, joined with his colleagues and the hon. Gentlemen above the gangway who had expressed themselves as dissatisfied with the grant. He had not entered into the manner of the distribution of the grant as he was in hopes that when the Chief Secretary came to the House to fulfil his promises to the teachers and to the House itself, he would come forward with a noble scheme. But instead of that he produced a miserable amount which would not meet the requirements of the case, thus indicating that the Irish nation would not get anything more from this Government than any other which preceded it.

* Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) said the grant made by the Treasury for this matter was admittedly short of the requirements, and cruel and harsh in its application. Nothing that had been said to-day was too strong with regard to the case of the school masters who had been rigorously excluded from participating in this grant. Reference had been made by the last hon. and learned Gentleman to the fact that the salaries of the teachers in Ireland were greatly lower than they should be. Even with the grant they were still less than those of teachers in England and Scotland, and the principle of the new grant seemed to be that: "To him that hath shall be given more, and to him that hath little even less shall be given." What they all felt that afternoon was that they ought to treat honestly and adequately the persons who were serving the State, the men and women who had entered their positions, not attracted by the emoluments, but expecting those emoluments to be increased from year to year. They got £40,000 last year for the improvement of school buildings, and that grant would be continued for two years more. It was miserably inadequate—but they were thankful for it—and they could do with another £100,000 to bring their schools up to the standard of those in England. They found that some 3,000 teachers were not to benefit in the slightest degree from the change which was being made. He represented a religious minority in Ireland and the religious community to which that minority belonged had made no small sacrifice to maintain their schools, and if the further grant now asked for was refused the additional burden would be found ultimately to fall upon them. In answer to a question that afternoon, the Chief Secretary had said that he was not responsible for the allocation of the money.

Mr. BIRRELL: No.

Mr. BARRIE said he understood him so to state, but if the Chief Secretary was responsible he would like to know on whose advice he had acted. He hoped it was not yet too late to give them the further £20,000 they wanted. He was sure the teachers who would gain by the present plan were generous enough to say that inadequate as their gain was they would rather it was whittled down than that some 3,000 teachers should get nothing at all. He hoped that that important matter would be pressed home as it had been that afternoon. They had had very guarded language used from the Nationalist benches and they had been told that if a Unionist Government had been on the Treasury bench it would probably have been less guarded. He was not going to deal with that, but a Member of the present Government, the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture, addressing a meeting a few days ago, had said that someone had suggested that if the Chief Secretary and he were much longer in Ireland, Ireland would be run at a loss, the inference being that the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture and the Chief Secretary made a great impression on the Treasury. He would like to see a little more evidence of that in the grant they were then dealing with. He felt very strongly that in that miserably inadequate grant the Government was not sufficiently responding to the claims of the friends of education in Ireland.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.) thought a great deal might be said of the advantages of large schools in every country. In the first place it was easier to get more competent teaching and better sanitary arrangements, but in these matters they had to be practical and look at things as they were and not as they would like them to be. He hoped that the refusal to give to the teachers of the small schools in Ireland the compensation or the increase which they were entitled to receive was not the thin end of the wedge towards abolishing the small schools altogether, but it looked very like it. If the teachers were starved out of those schools the consequence must be that by degrees the schools would be closed up, and the people in the districts served by them left without education. Anyone who knew anything about educational matters at all would agree that three miles of road was too long for children who had to tramp to school and tramp back again, particularly in bad weather. Many of these mites went to school none too well fed and without any provision for lunch during the day. While they stood up for these schools it must be remembered that they were not responsible for the legislation that had made the population so sparse in Ireland. Such as these schools were they must continue to exist if the people were to receive education. He could not understand the allocation of the money which it was proposed to make. If there was one profession the members of which must be carefully selected, it was the teaching profession. Schoolmasters required a great deal of tact, a certain perception of character, and an undounded supply of patience. Anybody who did not possess that was unfit to bring up children. The present system was no encouragement to people of good class to become schoolmasters and mistresses. The future of Ireland depended upon the proper education of the rising generation. It was impossible to overrate the importance of good teachers. Not only was it their duty to teach ordinary subjects but also to impart morals and manners to the children and if proper persons were required to impart information to and educate the young they must be paid respectable salaries. In Ireland they were wedded to a denominational system of education, and the Government would have a united Irish opposition against them in opposing a system which tended to close up many of the schools and destroy the denominational system. To destroy it by legislation would be the worst thing the Government could do. His hon. friend near him had referred to the condition of the schools, and to the wretched provision made for heating them. Of his own knowledge he had seen poor children, in the County of Tipperary, which was by no means an impoverished county, walking to school with only one sod of turf under the arm for the purpose of kindling it to give them warmth during school hours. That sort of thing should not exist in a civilised country. They now had an increased number of cottages with their ground attached erected throughout the country, and he thought it very necessary that children attending the schools should be taught something of agriculture. It would be a very wise step if the Department of Agriculture acting in conjunction with the Education Department endeavoured to take measures by which there would be imparted to the children some useful and practical information on agriculture. For his own part he would be pleased to see attached to all these schools a system which would give the people information as to the best way of cultivating small plots of ground, information which they could afterwards put into practice. He believed that if these small plots were worked properly, the people would find it better to live in their own country than to fly to other lands which they enriched with their labour. He thought with proper attention to that matter a better knowledge of how to cultivate these plots might be imparted, which would be of great advantage to the community as well as of great advantage to those who attended the schools. The salaries paid to teachers in Ireland compared most unfavourably with those paid in England, Scotland and Wales. In regard to this question of education, he recalled the time when Lord Randolph Churchill was over in Ireland. He was a man always observant of what occurred in Ireland, and took a great interest in that country. They did not see eye to eye with him in many respects, but at the same time he was a man who had the interests of Ireland at heart. He had sat with him in that House for a good many years, and he did not remember hardly ever hearing him say any unsympathetic word as to Ireland. Lord Randolph Churchill went through many schools in Ireland, and he recollected his stating that the Government had lost a great opportunity in not utilising the system which prevailed in the towns of Ireland conducted by the Christian Brothers. That body had a very admirable system; it was ready to hand, and he could never understand why some use had not been made of it. The people having become wedded to a certain system of education, surely that which was pursued by the Christian Brothers might be utilised with great advantage. Nothing could be more derogatory to this country than that for generations it should have endeavoured to foist on the people of Ireland a system of education which was abhorrent to them. If the people of Ireland were to some extent uneducated it was because the British Government had insisted on their adopting a system of education in which the people did not believe and which was abhorrent to them. He ventured to submit these remarks to the Chief Secretary, whose interest in education they all appreciated. Perhaps, before this session was over, the right hon. Gentleman would be able to solve the question which had baffled many statesmen before him. If he did that it would be a proud feather in his cap. He ventured to urge upon the right hon. Gentleman not to take the backward step which he was at present about to take—a step which would deprive the poorest districts of what they believed to be absolutely necessary. The adoption of the course the Chief Secretary was now taking would, he feared, be the thin end of the wedge in the direction of abolishing schools which were certainly necessary owing to the depopulation of the country caused by the British system of Government.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said the Chief Secretary must have been impressed by the striking unanimity which had been shown that afternoon by all the representatives from Ireland. It might be said that whenever there was a raid to be made on the Treasury, Irish representatives were unanimous; but in this case he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that it was something which went far deeper than that. It was the feeling not only that the action of the Treasury was parsimonious, but that it was also unjust; and it was the injustice of it even more than the parsimony of it, to which they desired to object. For himself, he objected to both. He had held for a long time that the national teachers in Ireland were the most ill-paid body of servants of the United Kingdom; and the thing which, to his mind, was to be condemned under these proposals which they were discussing, was that the most ill-paid men belonging to the most ill-paid body were precisely the men who were to be sacrificed. The Chief Secretary would remember a deputation to the Treasury about a year ago, on which occasion the case of these teachers was put to the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he thought he might say that it was done with unanswerable force. The old official defence which the Treasury used to put in for the ill payment of Irish teachers, was at that time abandoned. The old defence mainly was that because the schools were remote and the pupils few, therefore the teachers should be mulcted for these peculiarities of the country. He had always thought that an unsound defence, and he hoped it was now practically abandoned. But they had before them the fact already alluded to, that 3,000 out of the 13,000 teachers, and very nearly 3,000 schools out of 8,000 were to be excluded from the increased grant. That meant that about a third of the schools and about a fourth of the teachers of Ireland would get no share of the benefit of this increased grant. Therefore, this was not merely a personal question. From the personal side it seemed to him grossly unjust. But there was also another side to it. It had been suggested several times that afternoon, and he had no doubt truly, that the proposals of the Government were intended to initiate a much larger reform in the whole school system of Ireland, in regard to the amalgamation of schools. Personally he thought there was considerable room for a reform as regarded that system. He thought that in many cases small schools might be amalgamated, and with great advantage to the scholars who attended them. There were cases both in the north and south of Ireland where by amalgamation they might get an efficient school in which there would be two trained teachers instead of one untrained teacher. But any such reform must be carried out with the utmost care, for otherwise it would strike down to the root of religious liberty. Owing partly to the physical character of the country, and partly to the distribution of the population, and of the different classes of population, there were over a large part of Ireland districts in which it was imperative that they should have more schools than existed in similar areas in England. There were places in the South and West where there were scattered minorities living among large majorities, differing on religion. In the South and West of Ireland the minority was generally Protestant. There were similar Catholic minorities, though not so many, in Ulster. The conviction of everybody in Ireland was that in these cases they must protect the religious liberties of the minorities. He knew that in connection with the movement for the amalgamation, a good many schools had come to be very anxious about their future. In his own county of Kerry, there was a Protestant school at Kenmare—a parish which spread over twenty miles. The next nearest Protestant school in the adjoining parish was seven and a half miles off, and the next again from that was twenty-one miles off. A school inspector had been down there making inquiries as to whether that school could be abolished and cease to receive the Government grant. In connection with that particular school £250 had been spent on building a teacher's house, and £200 had been spent on the school building, out of a loan by the Board of Works, the repayment of which was privately guaranteed. These persons naturally looked with anxiety to this new policy, which they had never had any reason to anticipate. He was not for one moment saying that the policy reducing the number of schools in Ireland could not be equitably carried out. But it was a profound mistake to mix up these two things together the increase of the teachers' salaries and with it the new policy of suppressing small schools. It involved great personal injustice, caused very great apprehension, which went deeper than personal interests. If the policy was to be one of amalgamation let them have the policy properly articulated before them. Let them know exactly what it meant. But in attempting to reform the whole school system let them not do it by simply starving the existing teachers. He could not imagine anything more dangerous in a country like Ireland, from the point of view of statesmanship, than to create a discontented class out of the men in whose hands lay the upbringing of the youth of Ireland.

MR. T. M. HEALY said the hon. Gentleman had spoken about the parsimony and injustice of this grant. He wanted to ask about its legality. He wanted to know when did C. Hobhouse become the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland. This was a most extraordinary constitutional question which seemed to underlie this very audacious document which had been issued to Members. There was in Ireland a body called the National Board and that body worked under statute. There had been subsequent Acts passed for regulating the manner in which the National Board should do its duty and in which the moneys of the National Board should be distributed. He wanted to know when it became either the law of Parliament or the law of the land that a Treasury clerk could, by inserting a direction in an Estimate for which there was no constitutional warrant and no statutory authority, fetter the hands of the Chief Secretary and of the National Board. They could not legislate by Estimate. That Committee was merely a Committee upon which the Appropriation Bill would afterwards be founded. The Appropriation Bill would not contain any reference, he took it, to the words which were used in the Estimate and yet forsooth the Estimate they were told was to have statutory effect. The Government were granting a sum of £114,000. Was that done under an Act, and if so, under what Act was its distribution provided for? Was there any Act showing this:—"(*a*) Bonuses for scale for year ending 31st March, 1908, number of teachers paid by personal salary who are employed in schools having an average attendance of seventy pupils and above, approximate numbers; 510 teachers at £5; 415 teachers at £10; 140 teachers at £20; 150 teachers at £30; total, £14,000. (*b*) Extra capitation grant, 5s. per unit of average attendance of pupils, three to fifteen years of age, to teachers in all schools having an average attendance of not less than thirty-five pupils for the year ending 31st March, 1908; approximate attendance, 100,000; grand total, £114,000. Whitehall, Treasury Chambers, 22nd June, 1908.—C. HOBHOUSE." Was that statute? If it was not statute, why did they not bring in their Bill in order to warrant and enforce the distribution of this £114,000 in the manner provided by the Estimate? He did not say he was very familiar with the Irish Education Acts, but when he saw this extraordinary note he began to wonder how they were being governed, and accordingly he turned to the last Act regulating the distribution of grants in Ireland, the Act of 1892. Section 18 provided for the manner in which the grant was to be allocated—

> "After the financial year ending 31st March, 1892, there shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament an annual grant, in this Act called the school grant, in aid of education in elementary schools conducted in accordance with the regulations of the Commissioners of Education, £410,000 or such other amount as Parliament may determine, having regard to the amount of the fee grant under the Intermediate Education Act, 1891."

That was an English Act, and it simply provided, as far as he could make out, that there should be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament, the sum of 10s. per child, and accordingly the Irish Act went on and provided how that money should be distributed in the Fourth Schedule—

> "The school grant shall be applied by the Commissioners in accordance with the regulations to be made by them, with the concurrence of the Treasury, first, in augmenting by 20 per cent the existing rate of class salaries of teachers and of salaries of assistant teachers, and by 3s. 6d. the capitation grant to teachers; second, in granting a bonus of £9 to each male and £6 10s. to each female of five years standing; third, in awarding third-class salaries to each teacher of a school having an average attendance of twenty to thirty children."

So that the very case of schools having from twenty to thirty children was contemplated by the Fourth Schedule of this Act of 1892, and a special provision was made for it, and this they were told was exactly the class of children who were now to be excluded from all benefit whatever under this grant—

> "Fourthly, the residue shall be distributed as a capitation grant as nearly as possible in proportion to the average number of children daily attending the several schools in aid of

whom salaries or other money payments are paid by the Commissioners."

If any subsequent statute had been passed after that Act of 1892 he would be much obliged if the Secretary to the Treasury would refer him to it. But if no subsequent statute had been passed he wanted to know by what authority this Parliament discriminated between the kind of teachers and the kind of school that this money was to be divided and distributed amongst. They must have a discriminatory statute. Where was it? That brought him to this question. Were they governed by the Chief Secretary for Ireland or by the Secretary to the Treasury? He would have apprehended that this Minute would have been signed by some Irish authority. He was not aware that C. Hobhouse had ever seen Ireland in his life. When last they heard from him he was coming from India and he got this job on the Indian Ocean somewhere. Was it on the Indian Ocean that he picked up this method of distributing these Irish moneys? Certainly it was an extraordinary thing if that hon. Gentleman without any statutory authority whatever could propose to allocate this money. He did not blame the Chief Secretary in the least, and he dissociated himself from some of the criticisms recently passed upon him for his handling of this question. He thought he was doing his best and he trusted he would not take his criticism as personal to himself. But he thought the time had now arrived for them to make some stand on the constitutional aspect of the matter, and on that question he would like to refer to another incident that had taken place owing to the conduct of the Treasury in Ireland in the present year under this very Act of 1892, because this was just as base a scandal on the public of Ireland as they had already committed in regard to the teachers. In 1892, when compulsion was first applied to Ireland, the Members at that time, and notably Mr. Sexton, criticised the Act considerably as it was going through. It was provided for the first time that parents should be fined for not sending their children to school where there were schools within two miles radius. That was entirely novel in many parts of the country, and accordingly Mr. Sexton inserted this Amendment in the Act of 1892—

> "The expenses of school attendance committees and the salaries and expenses of the officers shall be defrayed by the local authority out of the local rate, and any revenue from penalties under this Act in the place or district shall be applied in relief of the local rate."

It was almost inconceivable. When he thought of the meanness of it, the illegality of it — it was almost impossible to use a word to describe the *chicane* of this transaction. England passed an Act on the faith that when this fine was inflicted the money arising from the fine should go in relief of the local rate. A Conservative Government passed the Act and, as long as they were in power, so long the fines were handed over to the local authority in accordance with the statutory enactment. In came the Liberals and in came the hon. Member for Tyrone, flush from election in a popular constituency, and in came the Attorney-General for Ireland, flush from election by Irish votes in Liverpool. These two gentlemen were ordered by some Treasury clerk to reverse this Statute. It was all very fine to say they had the Treasury's orders. They got a postcard from Downing Street. Was there no such thing as independence in the Irish Office? They reversed the action of the Conservative Party which had almost acquired the force of custom because it had been in existence for something like thirteen or fourteen years, and they dug out the Fines Act passed in 1850, and said, "The King cannot give up his revenue without express words," and as His Majesty's name was not mentioned in the Irish Education Act of 1892, Parliament was only poking fun at the Irish people when it said that any money derived from fines should be applied in relief of local rates. They paid the Attorney and Solicitor-General to argue that the Statute of fifty years before overrode the Act of 1892. It was said that the King could not surrender his revenue. How was it he surrendered it under a Tory Government? How was it he surrendered it from 1892 to 1908? How was it these changes to the detriment of the country were only made when the Liberal Party with Liberal law officers elected by popular constituences were sent to deal with these questions? Was Dublin Castle an annex of Downing Street? Was there no such thing as a personal equation to be found in that building or a Law Officer bold enough to say "I will not argue that foul is fair." What was good enough for the Right Hon. John Atkinson for fourteen or fifteen years ought to be good enough for the hon. Member for North Tyrone. He had said there should be a Committee of Parliament sitting upstairs to watch the Treasury day after day. When this scheme was in embryo and these little clerks—it was difficult to speak of them with respect —when these little animalculæ in the Treasury were planning how to swindle the country—that was the time when they needed to be alert. The time had now come when they should learn distinctly who was master in Ireland. Was it the Chief Secretary or the Lord-Lieutenant or the Irish Law Officers or some gentleman on the Indian Ocean who on his arrival at Port Said happened to find he was made King of Ireland?

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.) said he regretted that the action of the Government should fall so hard upon the smaller schools of Ireland. He spoke with a certain amount of feeling because owing to circumstances with which they were all familiar the effect on the small schools would fall more heavily on those of the Church of Ireland than any other. Since the year 1902, public monies had been devoted to schools which had a legal statutory limit of not less than ten and not more than twenty, but now apparently without any sanction of the Legislature the administrative custom of fifteen years was to be abandoned with the result that the smaller schools would be squeezed out of existence. That required some explanation. At present there was a mystery about it, but there were so many mysteries surrounding the action of the Chief Secretary that one more did not matter much. Was this policy adopted in order that it should fall more heavily upon the Church of Ireland than upon any other Church? Was it intended to squeeze out three-quarters of the schools of one particular Church, and that a Church which was politically opposed to the Chief Secretary? He would like to hear it justified on the ground of fairness. The Chief Secretary would find when the result of his proposed policy became known there would be a regular outburst on the part of those people who for the past fifteen years had been working to maintain the schools to which he had made reference. He joined in the general complaint as to the deplorable and disgraceful sanitary condition of the school houses. The Government had full knowledge of it but remained absolutely indifferent so far as action went, and even the National Members had done nothing. It was left to the Member for East Down to bring in a Bill for the heating and ventilation of schools in Ireland.

Mr. BIRRELL: What did your Party do during these fifteen years? I am doing something.

Mr. MOORE said that Mr. Dale's reports were four years old. The Chief Secretary never raised a finger to further the Bill. He held the Bill in his hand, and he thought it was a modest and useful measure which would have met the real difficulty. They ought to have a little more sympathy in this matter from the Government, and he hoped that hon. Members from Ireland who were supporting the Amendment would show that they meant business and go to a division. He remembered a similar occasion since this Government came into power when the same arguments were used as had been used on the present occasion. He regretted to say that the Amendment was withdrawn at that time. He hoped there would be a division that night, for the Chief Secretary had done nothing to meet the representations which had been made to him as to the necessity for improving the sanitary condition of the schools. The Government were entitled to credit in one matter—namely, the relaxation of the rules of the National Board as regarded the civil rights of teachers. Three years ago teachers were not allowed to go to fairs, to talk to their neighbours on politics, or to do a single thing which ordinary intelligent persons were allowed to do. These conditions which ought to have been removed long ago, had now been relaxed, and this had given great satisfaction to the teachers throughout the country. He thought that the men who were charged with the responsibility of the education of the youth in their districts, who were consulted on matters of law, medicine, divinity, and everything else, should not be subjected to the irritation of having to observe such rules.

Mr. J. MURPHY said the Government had only changed a portion of the rules.

Mr. MOORE said he was informed by schoolmasters, friends of his own, that the rules had been relaxed. One of his friends told him that he had received a communication on the subject; he did not know whether it was a circular or a letter, and the teacher was, therefore, going to attend a political meeting. He did not know the special rule to which the hon. Member referred. [An Hon. Member: The meeting was in North Armagh.] The meeting was not in North Armagh. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to use his influence in another matter, that was, in securing fixity of tenure. The Roman Catholic teachers were in a better position than the Protestant teachers in this respect, for their managers had assented to a form of contract under which any matter of conflict was left to the arbitration of the highest authority of the diocese. The Protestant teachers, unfortunately, had been unable to agree with their managers on any court of arbitration, and he asked whether the Commissioners had taken any steps to heal this administrative sore.

Mr. BIRRELL said the difficulty was that the Commissioners could only put in an arbitrator who was likely to meet with the consent of both parties. They were, however, trying to solve the difficulty.

Mr. MOORE was satisfied with this statement, but complained of the ludicrously inadequate salaries paid to the teachers in Ireland. If there must be an allocation, it seemed to him that it might be carried out at small expense. He was told that the sum of £15,000 would be ample to provide inducements to teachers who had gone to the trouble and expense of obtaining University degrees. If a teacher had gone to that expense, he ought to get the reward of merit in his own profession. He was not sure of the exact military term which was used in this connection, but he thought the teacher ought to get something in the nature of brevet rank for having so qualified himself. It would encourage the teachers, and it would have a tendency to bring additional students to the new universities. They were all agreed that teachers in Ireland were worse paid on the whole than policemen. He believed there was a Report in favour of increasing the pay of the police, and he was not sure that there was not to be legislation on the subject. [An Hon. Member: It has been promised.] It was on the *tapis* at any rate. While the police were to have their salaries raised, the unfortunate teachers who were engaged in schools with an attendance of less than thirty-five were shut out altogether, though the teachers in schools with over that number might get something more. He did not think it would take very much to give the teachers in the small schools an increase also. It was recognised that in education they had the real salvation of the country, and it seemed illogical and unjust that the people who were trained to impart it should be left impoverished in this way.

*Mr. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid.) complained of the large number of elementary schools in Ireland which received no assistance whatever from the State. It was bad enough to underpay teachers, but it was worse to deprive a large number of the school-going children of any capitation grant whatever. The older members who had sat through the discussions of Education Bills had been told that every child born within these realms was entitled as a birthright to be furnished with at least the rudiments of education. That might be the case, and he believed that it was the case in this country and Scotland, but certainly it was not the case with regard to thousands of boys in most of the towns of Ireland. He had tried to get from the Chief Secretary by question a report as to the number of school-going children in Ireland, but he was only able to get a return of those who attended the national schools, and model schools; he had obtained no information whatever as to the Christian Brothers' schools which were to be found in almost every town in the South and West, and also in many towns in Ulster, some of which contained to his knowledge several hundred pupils. He referred to the schools of the Order of Christian Brothers, which he believed gave education annually to from 15,000 to 20,000 boys. In 1892 the Minister who was then Secretary to the Treasury, speaking on this subject, after visiting the City of Cork declared that the Christian Brothers' schools were admirable and well-conducted. In passing, he might say that these schools, as regarded internal arrangements and sanitary accommodation were as complete as any in the United Kingdom, and that as regarded the teachers, there were none more efficient to be found in this or in any other country. That Minister declared that to refuse to make to these schools the same grants as were given to other voluntary schools was a state of things that could not be justified or defended. In 1896, Mr. Jackson, who was now a Member of the Upper House, but was then Chief Secretary for Ireland, was in charge of an Education Bill, and during its progress through this House he was confronted by the Nationalist Members, led by Mr. Sexton, with criticisms of certain provisions of his Bill, and particularly with a demand for a capitation grant for these schools. He promised that he would take steps to have the Christian Brothers' schools brought into line with the other schools in the matter of payment. On the strength of that assurance the Irish Members withdrew their opposition and the Bill passed. It might be only another illustration of broken promises given by Ministers, but Mr. Jackson, when charged with failing to give effect to promises while in office, replied that his term thereafter was very short and that he had handed over the carrying out of the arrangement to his successor, then Mr. Morley, who no doubt was as sympathetic to-day as he was then in regard to this matter, when he declared himself a strong supporter of the demand for a grant to the Christian Brothers' schools. Mr. Morley admitted that these schools were absolutely entitled to the Education Grant, and when pressed by Irish Members to give effect to the pledge given by his predecessor that he would do all he possibly could; and while he could not go so far as to give a solemn pledge, yet he would give an assurance that he would do what he could to have a regulation framed to meet the case and secure a contribution from the Education Grant to the Christian Brothers' schools. The right hon. Gentleman added that for himself, he did not wonder that the Irish members took every opportunity of pressing the claims of these voluntary schools on the attention of every British Government, whether Liberal or Tory. Fifteen long years had elapsed since that was said by Mr. Morley, and the demand for recognition of the schools had lain dormant all the while. He did not know why, unless other larger and more controversial questions had been brought forward and overshadowed this modest educational demand. However, he thought the time had now arrived when this claim should be pressed upon the House. Here perhaps it was right for him to say that he was giving expression to his own views and that he only spoke on his own behalf; the Christian Brothers themselves had made no application on the subject as far as he was aware. They had had no public meetings to further their claims; they had written no letters to the newspapers, or indeed made any complaint that the State was taking advantage of their silence and self-denial to evade a duty the performance of which in ordinary schools would cost about fifty thousand pounds a year. They were satisfied with silently doing their duty, and quietly carrying out the rules of their great founder, working with patience and hope. But that was no reason why Irish public men should allow them to be overlooked. Hence the thought had come to him as one who held for these humble men a high regard and whose children had been benefited by their teaching, to renew now the application made sixteen years ago by the then representatives of Ireland, full of the belief that the present Chief Secretary was likely to be sympathetic in the matter. While no doubt these schools would be carried on whether the

Government aided them or not, because Catholic parents who supported them would continue to make sacrifices to do so, was it right or fair that their labours should go unrewarded as far as the Treasury was concerned, or that wealthy England should take advantage of the conscientious scruples of Irish Catholics or of the silence and self-denial of the teachers in order to deprive Ireland of the sum required to educate her Catholic boys? As he had said, the Christian Brothers' schools contained from 15,000 to 20,000 boys; they were studded all over the cities and towns of Ireland, and many of the children went three, four, and even six miles to attend because their parents knew that their children would not only get a safe and sound education in the different branches of knowledge, but that their moral fibre would be strengthened, and their character formed by the example and admonition of their teachers—all which was for the benefit of the national weal. He assumed that the Christian Brothers were willing to adopt the same conscience clause in their primary schools as had been in use for the last twenty-five years in their intermediate schools, and no doubt they would be open to inspection and examination of pupils, so that really there ought not to be much difficulty in framing a rule under which the grant would be available. In 1892 the Commissioners submitted two propositions, but neither was acceptable to the Government. That was how the matter was when Mr. John Morley took office and that was how it stood to-day. He understood that the two obstacles in the way of the "Brothers" getting the grant were emblems and books. They refused to remove the cross, and they insisted upon using their own books. The Government need not ask the Christian Brothers to hide the cross behind a screen. That they would never consent to. They would follow faithfully the rules and regulations of the good man who founded them 100 years ago, and their mission would continue whether or not State aid was granted. He thought at this time of day there should be no insistence that the Emblem of Redemption should be removed from the schools. And as for their books, he would ask the Chief Secretary to look over them, and was willing to leave to him the decision as to their fitness, both from the literary and moral standpoints. This was a question easy of settlement, because it did not require legislation but sympathetic treatment, and could be done by the Chief Secretary and the Treasury. That being so, he hoped something to remove the grievance would be done without delay. He felt sure the Chief Secretary would have the support of Lord Morley if he brought the matter before his colleagues in the Cabinet, and it was full time that an end was put to the educational inequality which placed upon Catholic parents the burden of educating their boys while the education of Protestants was paid for by the State.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, West) said he was a member of the deputation of the teaching profession which waited on the Prime Minister when Chancellor of the Exchequer. They were then told that not only the schools and the salaries of the teachers, but the whole problem of primary education would be investigated. It was, therefore, with the greatest disappointment that they now found that in the Supplementary Estimate of £114,000 the most needy and probably the most useful class was to be excluded from the grant. He thought the question of primary education was going to be treated in a universal manner, and that the policy was not going to be to assist one part of the profession to the detriment and destruction of another. He did not think any Irish Member would suggest that the proposed increase in the salaries of the teachers who came under the conditions of the £114,000 grant was in any way too large, nor would it be suggested that it should be taken away. What they suggested was that the system under which primary education was carried on at the present time should not be more aggravated than it was. The only logical way out of the difficulty was to see that while the salaries of one portion of the teachers were increased, injustice and great hardship was not meted out to that section which was the worst paid. He would like to know whether hon. Members considered it just that teachers who were receiving from £120 to £200 should get by the allocation of this grant an increase of £15 or £20, while the teachers of £56 got absolutely nothing. It was lamentable that in the effort to remove the legitimate grievances of the Irish national schools, further friction, dissatisfaction, and in the teaching profession itself a great amount of jealousy should be created. From the Northern point of view small schools were not only desirable but absolutely necessary, and while he agreed that in some cases the amalgamation of schools would promote economy, they were bound to face the fact that small schools were absolutely necessary. If they were not available the children would be left without education, and, therefore, in a far worse state than at present. If Scottish and English Members had listened to this debate untrammelled by party ties they would, from an educational point of view, have voted for the poorer teachers in the rural districts of Ireland having some of the benefit of the grant. He had been specially asked by the Protestant Teachers' Union of the North of Ireland to bring before the Chief Secretary the very hard conditions under which they suffered on account of attendance. It was quite true that the Catholics had a more complete system than the Protestant teachers for preventing the arbitrary dismissal of a teacher, by means of arbitration. The Protestant teachers were liable to be dismissed without even knowing the charge which had been made against them. The teacher did not know what charge was made against him, and they had no power over the National Board to interfere. He did not wish to make any attack on the National Board. He thought that it had done its duty, though it was somewhat antiquated; but reform became absolutely necessary when it refused to make a rule or reguation which would give the teacher an opportunity of defending himself against a charge which might involve his dismissal. The hon. Gentleman who seconded the Motion had referred to the Commissioners of Education. He must say that he judged of a man as he found him, and he had always found Dr. Starkie courteous and desirous to do what he considered to be in the best interest of the Board, and at the same time to do his duty as a public servant. He did not blame Dr. Starkie; he blamed the Government which permitted such a system to exist. Were the Government powerless? Could they not help them out of this dilemna? These teachers were serving the State under difficulties, and reports were made against them without their having an opportunity of defending themselves. They knew what human nature was, and how there might be malice and spite operating on the part of a manager against the teacher. It was not fair that these teachers should be paid an inadequate salary, and that they should be put into a category where there was no fixity of tenure, and where there was no defence against possible malice on the part of one man against another. That House was the only place where those things could be remedied. He knew that the Chief Secretary was communicating with the Board of Education, and that he referred these matters to that body. He did not expect that the Chief Secretary was capable of looking after the whole of the numerous boards in Ireland, but he might have subordinates to assist him. Surely here was a grievance on the part of a class of servants in respect to which the Chief Secretary should exercise not only his judgment, but his authority and power, by letting the National Board understand that a condition of things would not be tolerated any longer in which private circulars were supplied as to the characters of the teachers, good or bad, and which might contain charges of which the teacher never heard, and therefore had no opportunity of answering. In British justice, and under the Liberal Government of reform, the teacher with £56 a year, who taught in a hovel, or a mud cabin called a school, with an attendance of thirty-five, and who was not considered worthy of an increase of salary, even he should be given an opportunity of defending himself against the arbitrary conduct which had sometimes been used against him. There ought to be some way out of this system, which was cruel and absurd. Public money was being spent, yet there was no power over the people who received the money, nor power to see that they who received it paid it to the teacher.

He knew of the case of one manager who took a dislike to the teacher. He went on his holidays, and the warrant for the teacher's salary was sent on to him, and not to the person who had done the work. The manager put it in his pocket, where he kept it for almost a month, so that the teacher did not receive the money he had earned, though he needed it to furnish himself with the necessaries of life. Why should a national teacher have to wait for a month before he received his salary? Why, a Cabinet Minister was not kept waiting in that way. The National Commissioners might be a little proud in their own way; in fact, as constituted they were outside public criticism. Let a Member put a Question down in that House with regard to the National Board, and where did that Question go? It went to Dublin Castle, to the very people who made the change, and it was they who gave the answer. And the Chief Secretary read to the House what was given to him in this way, so that the Member who asked for information was just as far forward as when he put the Question. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman not to refuse this request which was being made for a paltry addition to the grant. A sum of only £20,000 or £25,000 was required to bring these 3,000 teachers up to the level of their colleagues, and he thought that the Government which supplied additional sums for old-age pensions might at least afford this small amount. The Government had with one stroke of the pen added £300,000 to the sum which they had set aside for old-age pensions, to meet what was considered a case of hardship, yet they were refusing this paltry sum which would put these teachers in the same position as their colleagues. He appealed to the Irish Solicitor-General and to the Chief Secretary, who were sitting in a House from which Liberal and Tory Members were absent, and where only Irish Members were in their places, as though in a Parliament at College Green, to grant out of the £3,000,000 which came from Ireland to this country in taxation, this paltry sum of £25,000. Surely the Government recognised the reasonableness and justice of the demand, and had authority sufficient to grant it, not merely because it was backed by the unanimous voice of Ireland, but because it was just in itself, and that the justice of the case was reason sufficient for the additional grant.

MR. HARRINGTON (Dublin Harbour) said it was not his intention to prolong the debate, and he would not have intervened but for the observations made by the hon. Member for North Armagh. The hon. Member had congratulated the Chief Secretary on the changes which he had made, and had made a reference to the independence which he had shown. But he wished to refer to two cases which were most prominent before the people of Ireland last summer. One was the case of a teacher who had got married to a publican's daughter. The National Board refused to pay his salary, and said they would continue to do so as long as he continued to be connected with a public-house. There was nothing in the rules to justify that action. Their rule was that they were not to give a salary to a teacher so long as he was connected with a public-house, and they refused to pay so long as his wife was connected with a public house. But that was no reason why they should have kept that man's salary for two years. Fortunately, the teacher was able to maintain his position. The manager was in touch with him, and he kept on the school. A short while after complaint was made to the present Chief Secretary, and at length the Board itself gave way, and paid the teacher the salary which they had kept from him for two years. The other case which was referred to by the hon. Member for North Armagh was one of the most shameful cases of a man's dismissal that was ever known. He was a teacher at one of the Rathmines schools. He had occupied the position for twenty years; he was of the first division and first class by a special resolution of the Board. That was in 1896, when the Board had power to take in consideration a teacher's special services He was promoted in view of his excellent service, but the manager took occasion to dismiss him, and he appealed to the Archbishop, who refused to sanction the action of the parish priest. The next time the inspector visited the school, he gave a hostile report, the first ever given to the school. Immediately after that, the National Board went to dismiss the teacher, but it was put off for six months. The next time the inspectors went, not to examine the school, but to see him personally, they again presented a hostile report. In neither of these examinations, which were held for the purpose of dismissing the teacher and nothing else, was a pupil examined. It was the plain duty of any board to have given that man first a copy of the complaint against him and next a copy of the reports, especially having regard to the fact that they had themselves on their own Motion raised this man to the highest rank which they could give him for highly-efficient service, and a year or two afterwards dismissed him from his school. He did not look for another school, of course; he decided to have done with the Board. They would have sanctioned him in another school, but the whole thing, it was perfectly plain, was not to carry out the rules of the Board but to do away with the appeal to the Archbishop. They were able now to insist that a teacher must get a report, and if he desired another inspection he could get it, and he had practically three appeals now, so that it was impossible that they should do what they had done in the past. This unfortunate teacher who was dismissed from his employment without any compensation was altogether thirty years in the service of the National Board; he was only forty-two years of age, and consequently was without a pension, and without any consideration he was cast out of the service, though, without a doubt, it was entirely his fight and the attention drawn to it that settled the question of the future management of these schools.

MR. LARDNER (Monaghan, N.) said he agreed with the hon. Member for South Belfast when he said that this grant was spoilt. In his county there were 188 schools, only eighty-eight of which participated in these grants, and only sixteen of which got the bonus given to schools with an attendance of over seventy, and the bonus, with the exception of one case, was only £5. The maximum bonus under the Estimate he saw was £30. That was undoubtedly an illogical and inequitable state of affairs, but the case became much more illogical and inequitable when they took a specific case that had come to his knowledge, a case of a high-class teacher in a small school. He had the highest possible qualifications, and the very best reports from his inspector, but he had the misfortune to have under thirty-five in average attendance. He knew two other teachers who had anything but good reports, but they had the good luck to have over thirty-five on the roll, and they participated in this capitation grant from which the first-class teacher was excluded. They were told that the rain fell on the just and the unjust, but in this case the Treasury trickle seemed to be reserved for those who were perhaps less deserving than this unfortunate man who was serving one of the noblest purposes possible in a backward and poverty-stricken country. There was a multiplicity of small schools, and, therefore, education was more expensive in Ireland than it ought to be. The Chief Secretary had said that this was absolutely essential if the people were to get any education at all, and he fully agreed that the charge was not to be laid to their door. It was the Commissioners of Education themselves who were responsible. But the Treasury seemed to have made up its mind to starve out the small schools, and they would starve education in such constituencies as his. If in the past they had allowed this wrong system to grow up and to grow strong, they had accepted the responsibility for it, and they were bound to maintain it; it was their bounden duty to pay the teachers, the men who put brains into the children, a better salary than they paid the men who beat the brains out of them—the Irish constabulary. Not alone was the grant of £114,000 too small, but the additional £20,000 was too small. Had the whole thing been doubled they would not be giving nearly the salary which was paid to the Scottish teacher. The Scottish and Irish rural districts were very much the same, but the average attendance in Ireland was lower because in certain seasons of the year children had to work on the farms, though if they took the maximum roll at a time when there was no work going on in the country, they were responsible for the education of more boys and girls than teachers in similar schools in Scotland. The teachers, the people, the Irish Party and the councils were protesting against the basis of the division of this money. The Commissioners of Education themselves were protesting. The Chief Secretary on one occasion told them to formulate their demands. There was one solitary Minister and one solitary Liberal on the benches behind him, and Irish Unionists and Nationalists were joining in a demand to give them £20,000 to enable one-third of the teaching profession to be fairly treated.

*MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) said that as the subject of finance was associated with all their great reforms it might not be amiss for one who represented the Conservative Party and who was a representative of Scotland, to state his opinion in regard to the finance of this question. It had been said that one desire was to strengthen the hands of the Chief Secretary for Ireland in dealing with the Treasury. The right hon. Gentleman was known to be a thinking man and an honest man, and he was generally credited with a desire to do something really effective for the good of Ireland. He would say nothing to discredit that belief, but if the Chief Secretary really wished to go forward he should rid his mind of the idea that either England, Scotland, or Ireland would grudge money for education. Was not education really the most important subject they had to deal with? After the parents themselves the teacher had the most to do with the making of the coming generation. He had a strong feeling of reverence for the spirit of loyalty that forbade them to quit their old church when they thought she was perhaps not altogether what they desired. Religion was international and had to deal with men and women of all countries. At one time they heard a great deal about what were humorously called the three R's, but he hoped to see the adoption of the three D's—duty, discipline and drill; he would even venture to add a fourth in Development, of which they were not afraid in Scotland. It was the hope of some of them that Ireland would go forward, retain its religion, and also welcome the spirit of knowledge. It was a rapidly growing opinion in Ireland that education must be dealt with not in a niggardly but in a generous spirit.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.) reminded the Committee that when the late Government were in power with a full treasury the money exhausted not in social reforms or upon education, but at the behests of the Jingo Party in war. He complained of the inadequacy of the sum allocated for this grant, although he did not think it lay in the mouth of the Tory Party to complain of what the Government were doing for education in Ireland. They complained, as they had a perfect right to complain, not merely of the inadequacy of the money allocated, but of the manner in which it was to be spent. They complained of the old practice by which anything given to Ireland with the right hand was immediately obliterated with the left. They complained that the schools in the districts which most needed assistance were being left in the worst position by the manner in which the money was to be distributed. The process of amalgamation would go on, and by that very process many schools in Ireland would be shut up and made useless, all because the population of Ireland did not enable these schools to be filled with an adequate number of pupils. This was a question which affected not only the poor districts of the west of Ireland, but also the richer counties of Kildare and Westmeath. It was a very strange thing but it was a fact that more money was being spent on the constabulary in Ireland than upon education. They claimed that the money spent upon intermediate education in Ireland was purely Irish money, and there were other monies ear-marked for education which had been used for other purposes. All they were getting in return for all that was £114,000. He would not complain so much if that money was going to be administered fairly and properly, but the way it was proposed to administer the money would only lead to a worse condition of affairs in the rural districts where the children had to tramp many miles in order to get to school. The manner in which the money was allocated made it worthless, and the education system dangerous. Under those circumstances he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consent to alter the allocation, because if he did not great harm would be done to education. Every hon. Member who had taken part in the debate had spoken condemnatorily of the allocation which had been adopted. The National Board of Education was a most extraordinary product of British legislation, but even they were opposed to the allocation proposed. It was this kind of blundering which was constantly arising, that created bitterness, whereas, if the people of Ireland were treated fairly, no such bitterness would be engendered. The Government were not only allocating an insufficient sum, but they were allocating it wrongly, giving it to those who could well afford to do with less and giving nothing at all to those who deserved it most. Inspectors had gone down to places in the West of Ireland for the purpose of arranging the amalgamation of schools, shutting up one in one place and sending the children to another school. He had heard threats made that if these inspectors went on in this way they would not have a very easy task in the future. If the present allocation of the money was adhered to he was afraid a very serious injury would be done to primary education in Ireland.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) thought that the debate had convinced the Government that for once the Irish representatives were unanimous, and not only they but the entire body of the Irish people. The present Supplementary Estimate and the accompanying Note indicating the distribution of the money were an indication of a most singular condition of affairs even under the singular government of their country. There was a body called the Board of National Education which had control of primary education. It was a nominated Board that was quite independent, and was not responsible even to the Irish Government, and certainly not to the Irish people. They had continuously protested against it and had sought to have it abolished or amended. The extraordinary fact emerged in this debate that even that Board had not had its way with regard to the distribution of the money and that all the negotiations had been conducted in the dark and behind the backs of the Irish people. Not one single man among the representatives of Ireland had been let into the secret or consulted in any way. He would like to ask the Chief Secretary, what was the opinion of the National Board on the matter. What had been the nature of the communications that had passed between the Board and the Treasury? Would the right hon. Gentleman lay the correspondence on the Table? It had been said that to attempt to separate the responsibility of the Chief Secretary from that of the Treasury was to throw dust in the eyes of the Irish people. No doubt the correct constitutional theory was that the Government was responsible as a whole, but as a matter of fact the Treasury interfered with the government of Ireland incessantly and most mischievously and exercised an undue influence over Irish affairs. He contended that the Treasury had no right to interfere with the distribution of this money. What right had the British Treasury to cross over to Ireland, or even without crossing, to engage in long-winded correspondence with Irish Departments as to the use of money which had already been granted, or was about to be granted, to Ireland as if those gentlemen who sat at the Treasury had special knowledge of the needs of Ireland? He thought it was the most monstrous thing he had ever heard of. Whatever might be the constitutional theory, he asked the Chief Secretary to compare what was done in respect of Ireland with the administration of English Departments. Compare, for instance, the attitude of the Treasury towards the Board of Education with the intolerable system which had prevailed in Ireland. If the Board of Education in England obtained a Vote of money from Parliament, as they did very easily whenever they wanted it, they were not subjected to the strain and stress in dealing by the Treasury which Irish Departments were subjected to. When the English Board obtained a grant of £1,500,000 for the purpose of carrying out their views on primary education—he thought it was for a purely political purpose—there was no more correspondence between the

Treasury and the Board of Education. They distributed the money as they thought fit. But look what happened in Ireland. He would take one instance—the grant for the building of Irish schools. For fifteen years a correspondence went on between the Treasury and the Board of National Education in Ireland. Again and again when the representatives of Ireland raised the question they were told that it was still under discussion. They were not shown the correspondence. It was not published. During the period covered by the correspondence the whole question of school building was hung up, and many schools were allowed to fall into a ruinous condition. Whatever the constitutional theory might be, the practice in Ireland was entirely different from that in England. He did not acquit the Chief Secretary of all responsibility in this matter, because he had always recognised the solidarity of the Government; but they knew that the Treasury had interfered, and in so doing they had exhibited gross ignorance of the conditions of Irish life. He warned the Chief Secretary that an attempt to carry out these conditions would create a condition of absolute chaos and revolt, not only among teachers, but among the whole body of the population, irrespective of their religious beliefs or political opinions. As a Home Ruler he was not sure that he ought to object to such a policy, because it would afford an example of the British Treasury against the whole of the Irish nation, and that would be rather a wholesome state of affairs. What they complained of, first of all, was that Ireland was not treated in the same way as England and Scotland. If Ireland were treated on equal terms with England and Scotland, the amount of the grant for teachers would be £400,000 instead of £114,000. The result of the differentiation was that many of the best teachers were leaving Ireland in order to obtain payment upon a higher scale elsewhere. It was impossible to defend a system under which English and Scottish teachers were paid 40 or 50 per cent. more than were teachers in Ireland. He did not sympathise with those extremists who suggested that the Chief Secretary should be abused and attacked. The right hon. Gentleman was the fifth occupant of his office since the agitation for the better payment of Irish teachers was started, and he was the first who had done anything in this matter, and, therefore, to hold him up as a malefactor was idiotic, and it was a course not calculated to make other Irish Secretaries follow on the same lines. He was not going to dwell on the insufficiency of the grant. So far as the grant went they ought to be thankful for it, for it was some result of the agitation which had been carried on. When he turned to the question of the proposed distribution of the grant, really language failed to express his opinion. The grant was accompanied by a Note unlike anything he had ever seen in any previous Estimate. The Note had already been quoted. Those who taught in small schools with an attendance of under thirty-five were to get nothing at all. Language failed him to express his opinion of that. The teachers in the small schools in Ireland had, owing to the recent changes and to the method of promotion, been cruelly dealt with under the present system. In his view, the national teachers of Ireland, under the old system, although the salaries were very poor, had great incentives. Promotion was open to them; if they were able men, they could rise in the ranks of their profession, even if they had only twenty-five pupils. He had known some of the ablest of the whole body of Irish teachers who were employed in these small schools, and whose reputation had spread over all Ireland. When the new system of grading was introduced seven or eight years ago, those unfortunate teachers from no fault of their own at all, but from want of influence—and indeed those things were done from influence, and not by merit—could not get promotion to larger schools. They were condemned to remain in the lowest ranks of their profession all their lives, no matter what their abilities might be. That was a system which he had condemned for years. These teachers were already in a very bad position, but when this instalment of justice which had been looked forward to for several years by the teachers of Ireland—this £114,000—came along, these men were informed that because they were poor they would get nothing; and that the men who had the largest schools, comparatively, were to get all this money distributed among them. A more monstrous and grotesque system never was submitted to a Committee of the House. He had had communications from various parts of Ireland showing how some of the ablest teachers in the country in those small schools were barred out from promotion. The proposal before the Committee discriminated against these men. It had been said by one or two of his colleagues that if £20,000 were added to the grant, it would enable a grant to be given to the small schools; but he did not think that that would meet the necessities of the case. It would only amount to about £6 a year, and that was a very poor offer to make to the poorest and most unjustly treated of the Irish teachers. His objection lay not only to the exclusion of all the small schools from the distribution grant, but to the whole method of distribution. A teacher with 200 pupils would get from £10 to £15 additional salary, and a special bonus of 5s. a head, which would amount to £40 or £50; while a teacher of one of the small schools, who deserved more consideration from the grant, would only get £6. He suspected that the new distribution was adopted as a matter of policy, but these poor men had no power over the education policy of the Board of Education. If the Government policy was to amalgamate small schools, let it be openly declared; to amalgamate the small schools in Ireland by starving the small school teachers, who had no influence on the policy of the Government, was monstrous cruelty. It acted unfairly to the masters of the smaller schools and to the assistants of the larger schools. The right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University, who had joined the Nationalist Members in this matter, had a theory as to the cause of the existence of the small schools in Ireland. He said that it was necessitated by the provision of small schools for the different religious sects. That might apply to Ulster to a great extent, but he absolutely denied that it applied to the provinces of Connaught and Munster. It was a total misconception on the part of the hon. and learned Gentleman. The cause of small schools was the character of the country, mountainous and with bad roads, and the sparse population. Ireland was in its present condition, or the greater part of it, a country of small schools, and it must remain so unless they adopted the system which was followed in some parts of the United States of consolidating small schools, and organising a system of transportation by means of char-a-bancs or cars of children from the scattered districts to central schools. If they penalised the teachers of these small schools, which in absolute fact were a necessity of the country, they were declaring war on the only system of schools which could serve the population. Did anyone who took an interest in primary education deny the fact that the teacher in a small school—say with only thirty children—ought to be a better teacher than the master of a larger school? He deserved the utmost consideration instead of being punished as under the present system. In a large school the pupils were divided into classes, and the head master did not take them all himself. He had assistants. But the man who had only twenty-five pupils had to divide them into five or six classes, and take them all himself, which was the hardest work possible. Another consideration which had been forced upon his mind was that in a great many districts owing to this starvation of the small school teachers there were no educated men now except the priests and rectors. It was peculiarly unfortunate that that should be the case. When he was a boy, in his own district in the County of Mayo there was one of the most efficient teachers he had ever known in the course of his life. Boys came from places thirty to forty miles distant to get their education from him, and were content to board in the hovels of the peasants. That man rose under the old system to be master of a school, with a salary of £230 a year, while he was still quite a young man. His influence over the whole parish was extraordinary, and numbers of his boys succeeded remarkably in businesses established throughout the district, simply from the training they had got. Now, under the present system all these poor parishes were condemned to put up with the refuse of the teaching profession, because, once there, the schoolmaster was without hope of promotion. Over his school might be written the legend of Dante hung over the gates of Hell: "All hope abandon ye who enter here." When a man got into a small school, ambition was killed; he had no incentive to study or to make his school a success. Therefore, under the present system the Education Department were doing everything in their power to discourage and destroy education over a large portion of Ireland. He had a letter from the President of the Western Union of School Teachers, who said that the country was in a state of absolute revolt over this matter. This gentleman gave him the following figures:—In County Galway there were 390 schools. Of these, 138 had an attendance of under thirty-five pupils, and therefore got no benefit from the grant. In County Leitrim there were 197 schools, of which 118 were entirely excluded from the benefit of the grant, or more than 60 per cent., although Leitrim was a very poor county. In County Mayo there were 387 schools, of which 138 were excluded; in County Roscommon there were 230 schools, of which 104 were excluded; and in County Sligo there were 202, of which 109 were excluded. In the province of Connaught there were altogether 1,418 schools, of which 607 were entirely excluded from the benefits of the grant. The effect of this proposal would be not in any degree to satisfy the school teachers but to arouse a perfect storm of indignation and anger throughout the country. A speech of the Chief Secretary had been quoted, in which the right hon. Gentleman stated that Ireland was necessarily a land of small schools. That was undoubtedly true, but he asked the right hon. Gentleman to imagine the feelings of the teachers who were now being met with this slap across the face. He had received a letter from a teacher in which it was stated that to teach a small school more skill and ability were needed than to conduct a large school, and that letter was written by a gentleman who had taught successfully in both classes of schools. The Irish Members were opposed to the whole system of education in Ireland, they objected to this nominated Board, and they hoped before long to see it swept away and some form of authority established in Ireland responsible to the people. But pending this reform, they demanded that the fullest information should be given as to the communications that had passed between the Irish Board of National Education and the Treasury, and that they should be laid on the Table of the House. Then there was the question of grants to school buildings. There again the Chief Secretary had done a very substantial thing. They were ten or twelve years fighting to get the building grant for the Irish schools and they were never able to get a penny until the present Chief Secretary came into office. He had obtained for them £40,000 a year for three years. That was not £100,000, but it was better than nothing, and he protested against the theory that because they did not get the whole that they asked for they were therefore to reject and repudiate it—and belabour and beat the man who had given them what they had got. They were, however, promised that they would have a large additional grant from the Irish Development Fund. He remembered that when this fund was commenced he always believed it would be grabbed for all kinds of improper objects. They were promised a considerable addition to the £40,000 a year. But he found that in the Estimates for this year the distribution of the Development Grant was most singular and extraordinary. According to the Estimate there was a balance to the credit of the grant from last year of £91,000, to which was added £185,000, making in all £276,000. Then came the distribution which was made by the Lord-Lieutenant. In the course of the distribution came national school-buildings; £25,000 was the balance of a grant of £70,000, towards the cost of rebuilding necessitous schools in Ireland. That would have given, between the Development Grant and the grant direct from the Treasury, £65,000 towards the building of new and the rebuilding of old schools. That was not £100,000, but it was a good way on. But what was their horror and astonishment to find a reduced Estimate issued only last week, according to which the balance was not £95,000, but £51,000. The £40,000 had disappeared and there was no explanation. That was the result of this kind of finance, and when he turned to the distribution the unfortunate schools were the sufferers. National school buildings got £5,000; 20,000 had disappeared. What had become of the £40,000 and the £20,000? He objected to the disappearance of the balance of £40,000 and still more strongly to the fact that the loss was immediately saddled on the grants for repairing these unfortunate national schools. Of all the various conditions there was none which illustrated so much the necessity of Home Rule for Ireland as that of education. The education of Ireland had been ruined on every hand by that House. There was not to-day in the whole civilised world a more disgraceful system of education than that in Ireland, and that after 108 years of the government of that House. Yet when they brought forward this supreme and vital question they were faced by an absolutely empty House. It was an intolerable scandal that in these matters which Englishmen did not and could not understand, they would not take the trouble to listen to the debates, and that Irishmen should not be allowed to settle these matters for themselves.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: On a point of order——

MR. DILLON: I refuse to give way. There is no point of order. [Cries of "Sit down, Craig!"]

CAPTAIN CRAIG persisted and on being called on by the Deputy Chairman he asked if the hon. Member was at liberty to raise the whole question of Home Rule.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (Mr. CALDWELL, Lanarkshire, Mid.): As I understand it, it is an incidental allusion.

MR. DILLON said that after more practice in Committee Rooms upstairs the hon. and gallant Member would know what order meant. The debate had been an illustration of the extraordinary attempt to control the affairs of Ireland when great vital questions were treated as the question of education had been treated that day. It was not until some great disturbance arose in Ireland that they could in any way get the attention of the House of Commons.

MR. BIRRELL: We have had a long and interesting debate, in which, of course, there has been a great deal of repetition of arguments, owing to the undoubted fact that everybody has been of the same opinion. That, consequently, has prevented that variety of view which one often notices on Irish questions. I have had a good deal of advice given to me to which I have listened attentively as to the whole duty of a Chief Secretary. Some of the speakers have indicated a view that it is the duty of a Chief Secretary to make himself the spokesman of all the just and legitimate financial demands of the country. I quite agree with that, and I think if my conduct were known, I should be found to have discharged the whole duty of a Chief Secretary in this matter. When one goes to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and make these demands, he, of course, meets you with courtesy and consideration, but he points out that you are not the only one of his colleagues who presses demands upon him, he points to the several financial conditions of the country and indicates pretty plainly that he cannot give you an undue preference, adding that were he to concede the demands which he might conceive just and proper, bankruptcy and deficit would stare him in the face. Then the question arises, having regard to these statements, what is the Chief Secretary to do? He has only one course open to him, which course occurs naturally to his mind every week, and that is to tender his resignation, and say he will not be responsible any longer for the government of the country unless his fair financial demands can be instantly met, and that unless all other claims are put on one side and special attention given to him, he will take his seat with a light heart on a back bench, and indulge in that freedom of criticism which is generally noticeable on the part of those who have left the Government. My own opinion is that a person who is always threatening resignation is, after all, somewhat of a coward, and unless he is satisfied that he can do no good in the position he occupies, he had better remain there and bear the brunt of all criticism directed against him. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin, my predecessor in office and, therefore, always very friendly disposed, so far as political differences will allow, to a man in my position, pointed out—and I accept his view—that it would be absurd for a Chief Secretary to repudiate his colleagues of the Treasury. He has no right to do so, and that was why I admitted that I had a direct responsibility for this Estimate. We do not live in watertight compartments, we are bound one to the other. It is not until you go to a back bench that you have freedom of criticism. If on any particular point you are over-ruled by a Government of which you still remain a member, because the financial necessities do not admit of your request being granted, you have got to put up with it and allow yourself to be criticised and even abused for not having done more for the country you represent. I quite agree with that view. Then the right hon. Gentleman expressed a view with which I do not know if, constitutionally, I can altogether agree. He said that although I was bound to the Treasury, if I succeeded with the Treasury and got a grant of money for Irish purposes, I could waive all their terms and conditions on one side and say: "The money is mine and a fig for your conditions. You promised me £114,000, and it is not for you, but for me, for the Irish Government, to decide what is to be done with it." I cannot agree with that, because one cannot deny the right of the Treasury—it is not necessary to have a few animalculæ in a back room—one cannot deny the right of the Chancellor of the Exchequer——

MR. T. M. HEALY: Under what statute?

MR. BIRRELL: I will come to that. This is entirely new money. It is not subject to any existing Act of Parliament. It is quite open to the Irish Government and to the Treasury to endow Ireland with new money, and it is open to the Treasury to impose in the Resolution by which the money is voted what terms it likes, which terms become, under the Appropriation Act, part of the law of the land.

MR. T. M. HEALY: That is not what the Auditor-General said in 1882.

MR. BIRRELL: It is, at all events, news to me that, if new money is granted by way of a Supplementary Vote on an original Estimate for education in Ireland, it is immediately bound by previous statutory conditions with regard to money paid over to the National Commissioners or anybody else. I imagine, this being new money, it is open to the Treasury to impose what terms they like as to its disposition. I, therefore, cannot altogether agree with the right hon. Gentleman. After all, however, these are matters of constitutional law and learning and are a little bit beside the mark. I do not think it can be taken as a maxim admitted by everybody that, once the Treasury has acceded to the demands of a Chief Secretary with regard to a particular grant for education, it is not for them to impose terms as to the manner in which that fund is to be distributed.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us where the Treasury get that power.

MR. BIRRELL: I do not know. It is the Treasury, and that is why I accept the responsibility for this Estimate myself. I apprehend the Treasury would have the power. It goes without saying that any branch of the Government which has the control over money, would have the right to say: "We give you this money upon certain conditions as to its disposition, because we are anxious to procure a particular result." I cannot imagine what power there is in the Constitution to prevent that being done. I pass away from that to the merits of the question. I say at once that I presume the reason, as it has always been explained to me, of the conditions of this Estimate is that the Government is anxious to reduce the number of unnecessary schools in Ireland. Nobody disputes that the figures with regard to schools in Ireland are rather remarkable as compared with Scotland. For example, you find the two countries with practically the same population. In Ireland, with an estimated population of 4,399,000, there are 8,659 schools, while in Scotland with an estimated population of 4,652,000 there are only 3,240 schools. Therefore, in two countries with practically the same population and, in some respects at all events, in some parts of the country with very similar physical conditions, you have an enormous disparity in the number of schools. I quite agree when you come to investigate the circumstances of the two cases, these figures, although obviously striking, are not really so forcible as some people might suppose, because you find, for example, when you examine the last census, that there are forty towns in Scotland which have a population of over 10,000 each and with a total population of 2,369,705; that is, 52·9 per cent. of the entire population live in towns, whereas Ireland, with a total population nearly equal to that of Scotland, had only twenty-one towns having a population of over 10,000, with a total population of 1,033,232, or 23·2 per cent. of the entire population. In other words, more than one half of the population of Scotland is found in fairly large towns, while under one quarter of the population of Ireland is found in towns of the same size. At the same time, everybody who knows anything about Ireland knows that there are in different parts of the country an unnecessary number of schools. I am not speaking of the desire to send Protestants to Catholic Schools or *vice versa*, but of schools under the same management. Undoubtedly there are surplus schools in Ireland, and it is a most desirable thing, although a most difficult thing for anybody really interested in the financial position of Ireland, to reduce those schools. I quite agree I have not very warmly attached myself to the terms imposed by this Estimate. I think in all these cases you ought to consider the geographical circumstances and position of the school, and you ought not to punish a school simply because it happens to be in a part of the country which is sparsely inhabited and where you cannot possibly, under any circumstances, have a large average attendance, and where in point of fact you have to make up your minds between having no school at all and having a small one. At the same time I cannot allow it to go forth that there is not a very grave necessity for the reduction of a very considerable number of these 8,000 odd schools in different parts of Ireland. Nobody, I think, can claim to consider himself an educational reformer in Ireland who is not most anxious to do everything that can be done to reduce the number of these schools. That is one view which has to be borne in mind. Now we come to the actual Estimate. Although I quite agree that there is very much to criticise, I must say that had there been more people in the House they might almost have been led to believe, from what has been said, that the Government are taking away from school teachers pecuniary increment which they at present enjoy instead of making an increase thereto. It has been said that the effect of the proposed distribution will be to shut up schools, but I am not prepared to concede for a moment that those schools will be closed, even although the teachers in them have to go on receiving their present somewhat insufficient salaries. After all, the Committee must recollect that what we are discussing is an additional grant of £114,000 by way of increment to the salaries of school teachers. I quite agree the Irish people are entitled to have a voice in this matter. We are here to consider the most fair mode of distributing this not inconsiderable sum of money. You cannot meet altogether the demands of Ireland. I own I was slightly surprised to hear that a sum of £400,000 would have to be forthcoming before you could place the salaries of teachers in the rural parts of Ireland on the same footing as the salaries of the teachers in the rural parts of Scotland. I do not think that would bear investigation. I think on examination it would be found that there is very little difference, if any, between the salary of a teacher of a comparatively small school in Scotland, and the salary of a teacher of a comparatively small school in Ireland. I am quite willing to admit that £114,000 does not meet the necessities of the case, but, at all events, it is quite as large a sum as was in my mind when I went into the lion's den and addressed the teachers of Ireland. I am bound to say I have always found confidence is strictly observed in Ireland. If you are addressing people there, and you tell them in confidence you hope to get it for them, they always respect your confidence most scrupulously. I certainly gave many of the teachers cause to believe that some such sum as this—a sum not much exceeding £100,000—would be the very most I should be able to do for them for some time to come, and, though they did not say they would take that as a full discharge of their claims, they did not feel the profound discontent which the language of some speakers in the debate would lead us to suppose. They live on a small income, and they are desirous to get an addition to it to which they are clearly entitled. I think, therefore, so far as the amount of this Estimate goes, it is quite as considerable as in the bottom of their hearts they anticipated getting. It took a good deal of getting, and I certainly pleaded their cause with far greater pertinacity and emphasis than I ever pleaded any cause with which I had personally to do. Therefore, I am glad I have got this sum. 'It must be remembered also that there was £40,000 given for three years for the building of schools, and the schedule to the Irish Universities Bill. This Government has also produced a Budget which undoubtedly from an Irish point of view is the best they ever had. The reduction of the sugar tax will leave £340,000 a year to fructify in the pocket of the Irish peasant, and, in a literal sense, sweeten the cup of many a poor peasant in Ireland. And then it has been calculated that old-age pensions will represent a sum of something like £700,000 in the case of Ireland. So that, after all, great as has been our debt to Ireland and cruel as has been its treatment, owing chiefly to the ignorance of Ireland in this House in times gone by, I really think we are entitled to say we are doing our best to repay the debt. We have, therefore, got to consider now the best mode of distributing this fund. I cannot at present hold out any promise that it will be enlarged by one penny. I will not play the *role* of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He has played it himself at this box a good many times during the last week, and we all know what he says, and, having regard to other demands on the Treasury for purposes connected, it may be, with land purchase, certainly with the Congested Districts Board, with afforestation and other things, it would be very foolish of me to quarrel with the hand which is to feed me. It is all very well for the right hon. Gentleman opposite to ask why we should spoil a good job for a miserable £20,000 a year. There are so many miserable £20,000 a year, and they mount up to a considerable sum. Of course were education the only thing which had to be done for Ireland I quite agree it would be a contemptible policy to spoil a good thing by parsimony, but parsimony is sometimes not parsimony at all, but stern necessity. At all events I stand by my colleague in this matter and share his responsibility, happily in a less degree as far as the national finance is concerned, and I am not authorised to increase this fund this year. Therefore, the question simply is, how is it to be distributed. The hon. Member for Mayo said he thought he was entitled to know the opinion of the Commissioners on this subject. I do not mind telling him that the Commissioners favoured drawing the line at schools of twenty instead of thirty-five. The schools in Ireland with an attendance under ten are only eight; under twenty, 434; under thirty, 1,467; and between thirty and thirty-five, 908. These are the figures of the schools. Now I am bound to confess that I personally very largely share the views expressed by many Members in this House. I am no enemy of small schools, assuming always that they are small by virtue of the physical conditions of the locality. When I was at the Education Office I was often appealed to by small schools which had been suppressed, by perfectly justly economic considerations of county councils—I was appealed to to allow them to continue and I had in my time four or five of those appeals. One appeal was for a school in Bedfordshire where the country is in many parts very bleak and exposed, the roads very high and the weather very often exceedingly severe from falls of snow and otherwise. I never had one of these appeals without being convinced in those cases that those small schools were doing an exceedingly good work, and that the suppression of them would have meant the suppression of an influence for good. In all those cases my bias was strongly in favour of keeping up the small schools. Here in Ireland I agree in the great majority of cases in the South and West these small schools must exist, and they are most admirable and useful institutions. We might gather from the hon. Member for Mayo that the Government ought to give the biggest amount of the grant to the teachers with the smallest number of pupils. But the teacher with 200 pupils, under him does not get the grant for the whole 200—he might get the capitation fee for about seventy, and the balance is divided amongst the assistant teachers. So he is not such a capitalist as that. But when you come to consider the lot of a teacher with a class say of twenty, I quite agree his duties are most interesting, and he has an opportunity of impressing his personality upon his pupils, and if he is a man of fine character and generous disposition, they will learn more from him than they would do from the teachers perhaps in a very much larger school where there is not the same room for personal influence. The teacher with only twenty pupils, if he is a man of fine character and generous disposition, and takes all the classes, has a greater opportunity of impressing his personality upon his pupils, and he cannot expect the same remuneration as the man in a big school in a crowded locality with all the diverse duties imposed upon him. I feel that you must strike a distinction. Some men think it is better to be a country curate than a bishop. At any rate, the clergyman has the opportunity of enjoying the same simple natural life as the people amongst whom he lives. It is quite impossible to give the teachers in the smaller schools a slight superiority in capitation fee over those in the larger schools. I really think the teachers in the smaller schools derive certain advantages and benefits from their natural, simple lives, and they do not expect so large a remuneration as those who live in crowded localities. I quite agree with what has been said about the grading rule. Having had an opportunity of discussing the point with the Commissioners I think that any rule that prevents promotion or stereotypes a man for ever in a particular class of school is, in my opinion, a great mistake. It may very well be that a young teacher develops his teaching abilities better in a small school when he takes all the classes and exercises sole control. But if he is stuck there for the rest of his life, without chance of promotion, that would be a harsh rule. The Treasury, however, has nothing to do with that, but I will certainly see whether some reconsideration may not be given to the point, although I have no control over the Board of Commissioners. I think it is not only a harsh rule, but it is a very foolish rule in the interests of the Treasury. I now come to the question of what is to be done in regard to this matter. The Commissioners propose that the capitation fee should be divided in a way that would leave out 442 schools. I have been brought up in the Court of Equity, where I was taught that equality is equity, and equity is equality, and my own natural disposition is to see this sum, extracted not without toil, distributed amongst the teachers, but whether all the teachers should be included, or whether those in the schools of under twenty scholars should be left out, is a matter which requires to be most carefully considered. Unlike one of my colleagues I cannot take the sense of the House whilst standing on my legs. There is not much in the point, but it must be borne in mind that I cannot get any more money. If I do what I have promised, the capitation fee will have to be reduced, but I really think there is sufficient solidarity and *esprit de corps* among the teachers to be willing for the present to submit to this reduction. I do not know that I can usefully say more than that now. The course I propose to take is to withdraw the Estimate in its present shape and, after consultation with the Commissioners of National Education, to bring it up again in a form including all schools. I must repudiate the idea suggested by an hon. Member from Ulster that there is in the policy of the Treasury any hostility to the schools of the Church of Ireland. Whatever the Treasury may be, and it has many faults, it at any rate is a most undenominational body, and the idea that the Treasury would wage war upon the schools of a particular denomination in order to destroy them is altogether out of the question. Undoubtedly what the Treasury has in mind and what every educational reformer in Ireland must have in mind is the desire to reduce the unnecessary number of schools in particular parts of Ireland. I could give instances, but I do not want to rouse the denominational spirit. In some places there are as many as four schools belonging to four different Protestant denominations. The object to be aimed at—unpopular though it may be—is to get the children of these districts into two schools—if not into one—instead of into four; and I am glad to notice a disposition among some of the Protestant bodies to bring about a reduction of school staffs by amalgamation. The duplication of staffs is a great and undoubted evil, and it cannot be denied that we were justified in putting a certain amount of pressure upon the Board to pursue that subject. Whether the right way of putting on that pressure was to reduce the increments of the teachers is a subject which it is not now necessary for me, having acceded to the general wish of the House, to deal any further with. I hope, however, I may be allowed to obtain the first Vote on the Paper, and then I will bring up the Supplementary Vote in the form I have suggested.

MR. T. M. HEALY suggested the withdrawal of the Vote.

MR. BIRRELL: I am the last to stickle over a matter of form, so long as I get the money.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I do not quite understand the point of order. The question put from the Chair is the Supplementary Vote.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Quite so. You only put the question, as I understand it, that the sum of £114,000 be granted to His Majesty for the service stated. You do not attach to it all the embroidery attached to it by the Treasury.

MR. DILLON: The Chief Secretary offered to consult all parties. If the Vote is withdrawn now, we shall have an opportunity of saying something about it again. If we vote the money now, we shall not be able to do it.

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot agree to withdraw the Vote now, for I want to say a word upon a question which excites very strong interest. It was referred to by the hon. Member for East Clare, namely, the sad state of many of the schools in Ireland, particularly in wet and cold weather. The weather in Ireland is not particularly cold, but it is extraordinarily wet. I have seen the thing for myself, and I know about it from conversation with inspectors. They have often told me that in going into one of these schools on a soaking wet day, and finding the children cowering in clothes saturated with damp round a miserable turf fire, they felt that, in the interest of the children themselves, the best thing was to tell them to go home and forego the inestimable benefits of education for that day. That is a very shocking state of things, and, of course, a claim has been put forward for the heating of the schools. But it is impossible to overlook the fact that in Ireland there is no such thing as a school rate, and that it was undoubtedly always contemplated that the form which the local contribution would take would be in seeing, as a matter of parochial pride, that the schools should not be in the lamentable condition in which I have solemnly to admit they are. Prone as I am to love everything Irish, I cannot in this matter exonerate the local authorities from considerable responsibility. The sums required are not large. The people left to themselves are a generous people—the most generous I have ever been brought into contact with, most generous to one another; but they have got the notion that everything that has to be paid for in connection with the schools should come from the British Exchequer, and they have forgotten—I do not blame them; people do forget these things—perhaps some of them did not even know, that it was certainly always the understanding that, there being no school rate in Ireland—though there are rates now for labourers' cottages and the like which they bear with astonishing patience—they should look after the comfort of the children. I think they ought to have brought home to them that it is something of a shame that they should allow the children to whom they are so deeply attached to incur the risks of tuberculosis and those other terrible diseases which ravish the children of Ireland, and that they have as much obligation to the children and their school-house as to anything else they hold dear. Although I have pressed this case, and I daresay shall continue to do so, I find it difficult to resist the argument that it is really a matter in which the Irish people might, at no great cost to themselves, be brought to take a personal care and interest. I have at all events, failed in obtaining the grant I sought for. I would have liked to have been able to make some proposal in regard to this; but I hope the words I have said will not be taken amiss by any Irishman or lover of Ireland. Other little matters have been referred to. I listened to what the hon. Member said about the Christian Brothers. He told me the other day that he might take the opportunity of referring to them. I have seen what has been said by my predecessors at different times in regard to them, but I do not require to learn from them, for I have seen for myself whilst in Ireland, the schools of the Christian Brothers over and over again. I have seen their famous school in Cork. Everybody who sees their schools appreciates their value, and the part they have played for many a long day in Irish education. Although I am on terms of friendship with the Christian Brothers they have never approached me and I am not certain what their views are. I think they value their freedom. The hon. Member was careful to say that he did not represent their views to me. I also wish I had a little more freedom myself, for I value it. They do a great work in Ireland. Parents prefer their schools partly because they carry out their work in their own way without being bothered by the public authorities. Although so far as inspection as to the value of their educational work is concerned, they have been willing to submit to it, I am not sure what their views are on the subject, and were they to present them to me, I should consider them most sympathetically. I do not think that the books used in the schools represent the difficulty it was at one time. I think we have got past that, always assuming that the books are educational and up to the mark. I cannot think that there will be any difficulty on that ground, because the opinion is exploded as to children using the same books from the north to the south of Ireland. With reference to the sacred emblems of religion, that is a matter I am not now going into. I do not know what the feeling in Ireland now is on the subject, but I certainly share the opinion expressed by more than one of my predecessors upon the value of the work done by the Christian Brothers, and were I assured that they were desirous of parting to some extent with the complete freedom which they now enjoy I would be willing to consider any proposal they might make. Having regard to the great work they do in Ireland, I think it would be impertinent on my part to express anything more than I have done.

MR. DILLON: What of the £35,000?

MR. BIRRELL: I am sorry that, this not being on the Vote, I have not the material before me to answer the hon. Member's Question. I have taken a note of what the hon. Member said, and I expect that I shall be able to tell him of the missing £35,000 when inquiry has been made. Something was said about an appeal in the case of Protestant teachers. That is a very important question, and I am all in favour of a schoolmaster feeling that he is not liable to be dismissed by the arbitrary will of anybody, because we all know that in scholastic matters tempers are often short and hasty things may sometimes be done. In the case of the Catholics there is a willingness to submit any case of dispute to the bishop of the diocese. Roughly speaking, it may be said that the appeal to the bishop is satisfactory. The only thing is to find an equally satisfactory appeal in the case of the Protestant community. I understood the hon. Member for South Belfast to say that the teachers were prepared with an appellate jurisdiction but that the managers did not agree; but I am quite willing to put the case again to the Education Commissioners.

MR. SLOAN said that what he had stated was that the teachers had made representations to the right hon. Gentleman himself; that he had put them before the Board of Education without success; but that he did not know whether the managers would agree.

MR. BIRRELL: I know that difficulties have arisen. I quite understand that the teachers and the managers are not quite agreed at present as to whom they should appeal to; but I will refer it again to the Commissioners, and I hope some satisfactory appellate Court will be found. It is, however, a little too much to put on the Commissioners the duty of finding a Court for two rival parties in which each has equal confidence, and it would be rather difficult to force a Court on one of the parties if that party was indisposed to accept a decision of that Court as final. It is a matter for negotiation, but it is a most important matter to come to some speedy decision about. My hon. friend the Member for East Kerry was a little troubled about the licensed house question. I am bound to say that I think it is pre-eminently undesirable that any one occupying the position of a teacher should be directly or indirectly, or even accidentally, connected with a public-house. I am assured by the Commissioners that their rule has not really had any retrospective effect, and, therefore, I must, for once, stand by the recognised authorities. I feel that this debate has been useful, though I do not know whether there will be any sore hearts over it. I believe that the Committee has exercised a wise judgment in being so comparatively unanimous on the subject; and I hope good will come out of a decision which will, at all events, not carry with it to anybody the sense of injustice. I am quite with the decision of the House that the Government has done its best.

MR. WALTER LONG said that the Chief Secretary had made a reference to a remark he had made earlier in the debate in which he thought the right hon. Gentleman had somewhat misrepresented him. First of all, he wished to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the dexterous way in which he had extricated himself and his colleagues out of a somewhat difficult position. He was very glad he had seen fit to change the attitude of the Government and make the valuable concession he had promised, but he regretted very much that the right hon. Gentleman was not able to go a little further and get the extra £25,000 which would have enabled the poorer teachers in the smaller schools to get a *pro rata* addition without deducting anything from the teachers in the larger schools. The right hon. Gentleman had poured contempt on his description of the £20,000 that was wanted for the smaller schools, but the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that earlier in his period of office he had extracted from the Treasury a promise of £680,000 to sweeten the Government of Ireland—a great portion of which was intended for education.

MR. BIRRELL: If the right hon. Gentleman wants to know the sad history of the past, that £650,000 was calculated on the basis of giving £100,000 to education.

MR. WALTER LONG said that Ireland no doubt would have benefited enormously by getting the £650,000, but the right hon. Gentleman might have been able to get the extra £20,000 or £25,000 for the smaller schools. He was, however, very glad that the right hon. Gentleman had made the concession he had. With regard to his view that the Irish Government ought to maintain their own right to distribute the money conceded by the Treasury, the Chief Secretary said that the Treasury had only exercised its constitutional right. With great respect to the right hon. Gentleman, who was a high constitutional authority, he did not admit that for a moment, his view being that where a Government Department, whether it was the Irish Government, the War Office, the Admiralty, or any other, had established its right to Government money for a particular purpose it rested with the Department to distribute the money for the purpose defined. Supposing that the Treasury granted money for educational purposes in Ireland, it would be quite wrong for the Irish Government to spend it, for instance, in the establishment of hospitals, but it should have the right to decide how it should be applied educationally. That was exactly what had happened in this case, because it was the Chief Secretary and not the Treasury who had announced the change of policy to which they had listened. Therefore the action of the Committee was a vindication of the view he had put forward, and he hoped that the step the right hon. Gentleman had taken would help in asserting the right of every Minister to distribute money granted for a particular purpose within his own Department in the way that he thought most beneficial, efficacious, and just. He thought that the Chief Secretary had somewhat misunderstood his hon. friend behind him when he referred to the Church schools. His hon. friend had not for a moment suggested that there was any covert attack made on the Church of Ireland schools. What his hon. friend referred to was that in some parts of Ireland the operation of the Supplementary Estimate would have a severe effect on Church of Ireland schools. They had held very strongly that if the money were distributed as had been proposed it would operate very unfairly on a very deserving class that could not defend itself, and he rejoiced that the Chief Secretary had receded from that position.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (MR. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.) said that he spoke on behalf of a Department that must always be an unpopular one, because it had to control rather than encourage expenditure. After an experience of a month or two at the Treasury he would not have ventured to lay down any rule unless he had had behind him the experience of the Department. He ventured to assert that during the time of office of the late Chief Secretary it had never been successfully held by any Department that the Treasury was not entitled not merely to interfere in the gross amount of the sum to be expended, but to criticise the method in which that sum was to be spent, and to make conditions that it should be spent in a certain way.

MR. WALTER LONG said it was well known that the Treasury and the various Departments had their negotiations, and in every case there was behind all the authority of the Cabinet, who settled whether the Department or the Treasury was to have the final word.

MR. HOBHOUSE said that that imparted an aspect which the right hon. Gentleman had not put before the House. Nothing had been said of the power and authority of the Cabinet.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he had no hesitation in thanking the Chief Secretary for the efforts he had made to improve education in Ireland. He recognised that he had made great efforts, and that he had given great assistance to the national schoolmasters; he had given them about three times as much as had been given to University education. There was, however, no doubt that the Treasury had been a curse in the life of Ireland, and he thought they must take some stand against the growing attitude the Treasury was assuming of attempting to legislate for the country. That was why he now said it would be better from the constitutional point of view that when grants were given to Ireland they should not have a fresh Estimate put forward and a fresh attempt at legislation. He denied altogether that the Treasury was entitled to say how this money should be spent. The Appropriation Act had been referred to as legalising what had been done in this case. He denied that. He recollected that when Mr. Gladstone, in 1881, sought to increase the salaries of certain resident magistrates he argued that it was legalised, first, by the passage of a Resolution in Committee, and then by the Appropriation Act, but in the result the Comptroller-General disallowed the amounts, and Mr. Gladstone brought in a Bill to legalise the payments, and it was defeated. That was not a precedent in favour of the Government, but against them. To bring forward a fresh Estimate and to say that by it schools with twenty or thirty scholars were to have money allocated to them in a particular way would be illegal. The Treasury must remember that Ireland had certain rights under the Act of 1817 by which the Irish and British Exchequers were amalgamated. The Chief Secretary misinterpreted the feeling of the Nationalist Members if he supposed they were ungrateful to him.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) expressed a hope that next year the Chief Secretary might be able to increase the amount of the Vote. The right hon. Gentleman having met the Nationalists in regard to the allocation of the grant, he advised his hon. friend to withdraw the Amendment.

*MR. BYLES (Salford, N.) said that year after year Irish Members brought before the House the gross inequality with which Ireland was treated in regard to education, and they were met with sympathetic speeches by the Chief Secretary, but still with a *non possumus.* The right hon. Gentleman had told them that while he was called the King of Ireland he was not the King of the Cabinet, and that he could not get what he wanted. As an English Member he listened year after year to these stories of injustice with sorrow and a sense of shame. Parliament had been justly charged with gross injustice. Why should a child because he was born on the other side of the Irish Channel be handicapped in his opportunity for primary education? He knew these country schools in Ireland where the little children with bare feet, and often scantily clothed, stood on the clay floor, their only comfort being the miserable turf fire, and then he thought of the council schools in England, and the infinite opportunities given to the English child, and he wanted to know why the Irish child should be treated with this inequality. The English nation ought to feel their responsibilities in this matter and to be ashamed to be charged with gross injustice. They ought to say: "We are rich and they are poor. We are a big country, and they are a small and despised people." ["No."] He would be only too glad if that word could be withdrawn, but he was only too afraid there was some truth in it. They were in the minority, and they came a great distance to plead their case, but they kicked against the pricks and could do nothing. They came and laid their case before the Government and were met with a *non possumus*. ["No."] He thought hon. Members next year would have very nearly the same tale of injustice to unfold. If it were not so, he would be only too glad. He asked Members of English constituencies to consider this argument. The Irish child had just as strong a claim as the English child and ought to be just as well educated.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.) said he knew female National teachers of high training—teachers who had increased the efficiency of their schools to a considerable extent, but whose services as principal teachers were discontinued solely because the average required by the Commissioners of National education could not be reached. This meant, in a number of cases, the abolition of separate female schools, and the practical dismissal of teachers. Parents who objected to have their daughters sent to mixed schools were placed in a position of great inconvenience, especially in rural districts, where children had had to travel for miles in order to reach female schools. He hoped the matter would be inquired into.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

£670,818, to complete the sum for Public Education, Ireland.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Joseph Pease.*)

MR. MULDOON (Wicklow, E.) protested against the adjournment of the House before eleven o'clock. He thought the Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill might very well be passed. It had received the acceptance of all parties in Ireland.

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the Motion for the Adjournment of the House lapsed without Question put.

LOCAL REGISTRATION OF TITLE (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; Bill read the third time, and passed.

URBAN DISTRICT COUNCILS (ADVERTISING) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged.

Bill withdrawn.

Adjourned at two minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 3rd July, 1908.

The House met at Twelve noon of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH.

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Leith Burgh Bill [Lords]. Wath and Bolton Gas Board Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

Blaydon and Ryton Water (Transfer) Bill. Bromley and Crays Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

Upton Town Hall Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Briton Ferry Urban District Council Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Assynt, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions in favour; From Abersychan; Browney; Dalzell; Resolven; and, Silsden; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dalzell, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ARMY (TERRITORIAL FORCE).

Copy presented, of Regulations for the Territorial Force and the County Associations, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1907.

Copy presented, of Return giving particulars of cases in which persons have been reinstated with the assistance of the Estates Commissioners during the quarter ended 31st March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Parliamentary Voters.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what are the estimated numbers in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the United Kingdom, respectively, of each of the following classes of persons: men over twenty-one years of age who are Parliamentary voters, men over twenty-one years of age who are not Parliamentary voters, and women over twenty-one years of age.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. I fear that the materials for giving the precise information asked for do not exist. The Table which follows is the nearest approach to it that I am able to make, but any calculation based on a subtraction of the figures in column 1 from those in column 2 would be vitiated by the fact that there are no means of estimating how many plural voters are included in column 1.

It is supposed that they may number about 784,000 in all, but this figure is not sufficiently reliable to be used for the purpose of statistics

	Number of names appearing on the registers of parliamentary voters for 1908.	Estimated male adult population on 1st January, 1908.	Estimated female adult population on 1st January, 1908.
England and Wales - - -	6,058,894	9,230,289	10,327,469
Scotland - - - - - -	762,861	1,233,893	1,377,241
Ireland - - - - - -	692,726	1,207,524	1,267,794
Total - -	7,514,481	11,671,706	12,972,504

Post Office Clerks—Hours of Attendance.

MR. JAMES PARKER (Halifax): To ask the Postmaster-General what are the hours of attendance required from assistant clerks serving in the Engineer-in-Chief's Office and the Savings Bank Department of the Post Office, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The hours of attendance which assistant clerks are at present required to give are, in the Engineer-in-Chief's Office, seven daily from Monday to Friday, and three and a half hours on Saturday; in the Savings Bank Department, seven hours daily from Monday to Friday and four hours on Saturday. But the scale of pay of assistant clerks wherever employed covers an attendance of forty-two hours a week.

Promotion of Post Office Linesmen.

MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the Postmaster-General, in view of the fact that a considerable number of linemen hold technical and scientific qualifications, some of whom are teaching the subjects of magnetism and electricity in technical institutions under the Board of Education and who are also performing supervisory duties in the engineering department, will he state why unestablished youths are placed in favoured positions and styled acting inspectors, and are promised promotion over the heads of capable and efficient officers who have served the Department for a number of years.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have already assured the linesmen, in answer to a memorial from representatives of their body, that not a single place proper to the linesmen class will be lost to that class through the earlier selection of some of the younger men for duties requiring different qualifications. The Question has its origin in a mere misapprehension, which has already been explained.

Vaccination of Postal Employees.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): To ask the Postmaster-General what are the regulations with regard to the vaccination of the staff and employees in the Post Office, including the telegraph and telephone departments.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Candidates for Post Office employment are required to be re-vaccinated unless they exhibit good marks of primary and secondary vaccination or definite evidence of having had small-pox. The only exceptions to this regulation are applicants for appointment as commission sub-postmasters and persons casually employed for short periods.

Scottish Fishery Board—Fees and Expenses.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the sums received from the Treasury for fees and expenses by each of the members of the Scottish Fishery Board during each of the years 1906 and 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The information desired by my hon. friend is as follows:—(1) No fees were paid to any members of the Board during either 1906 or 1907. (2) The travelling expenses paid were:—

	1906.			1907.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Mr. Angus Sutherland, C.B., Chairman - -	1	1	0	3	6	9
Sheriff D. Crawford, K.C., Deputy Chairman -	2	10	4	2	9	6
Professor D'Arcy W. Thompson, C.B. - -	2	10	0	17	15	6
Dr. W. R. Duguid, Buckie - - - -	38	6	0	43	1	9
Mr. L. Milloy, Rothesay - - - - -	22	6	7	21	18	6
Mr. H. Watson, Anstruther - - - -	7	2	3	10	2	1
Mr. D. Mearns, Aberdeen - - - - -	26	2	0	26	11	0

Treatment of Glanders.

COLONEL WALKER (Lancashire, Widnes): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, in view of the continued prevalence of glanders in London, whether the Board of Agriculture will now consider the necessity of adopting the Rideal-Walker method of controlling the supplies of disinfectants called for under their order, such method having been adopted by the War Office, Admiralty, and Board of Trade.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The outbreaks of glanders in London are steadily decreasing, the number of outbreaks this year to the 20th ultimo being 248, as compared with 302 for the corresponding period of last year. Its prevalence would not in any way appear to be due to the failure of the present method of disinfection, and the Board are advised that no advantage would be gained by the adoption of the method to which the hon. Member refers.

Migration of Isle of Lewis Cottars.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the qualifications required of cottars in the Island of Lewis who have sent in their names as willing to migrate to the mainland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The landward committee of the parish council of Stornoway have been asked to furnish the Congested Districts Board with information regarding the means and experience of each applicant, so that the Board may know whether any, and, if so, how many, such qualified applicants the landward committee wish to put forward for consideration.

Imports of Foreign Malt.

MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state the quantity of foreign malt imported into this country in the years 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, and 1907, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The quantities of malt imported into the United Kingdom from foreign countries during the years named were as follows:—

	Cwts.
1903 - - -	847
1904 - - -	5,203
1905 - - -	4,930
1906 - - -	15,122
1907 - - -	18,635

No malt was imported in any of these years from British Possessions.

Irish School Rules for Teachers.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether in a national school, Roll No. 1950, Circuit 9, Section A, the infants are being effectively and efficiently taught at present; if so, why the Commissioners of National Education make it a condition before enlarging the school that future assistants shall be females; whether the average for the past five years has been steadily increasing; whether the appointment of a female might have the result of lowering the attendance; whether at present two teachers and a monitor are engaged in one small room; and whether in view of all these facts, the Commissioners will favourably consider the application of the manager.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners inform me that the school in question is reported to be conducted efficiently. Under Rule 127 (b) boys under seven years of age are ineligible for enrolment in a boys school where there is no mistress, unless there is no suitable school in the locality, or the probable result will be the loss of an assistant teacher to the school. In the existing school the rule has not been enforced because there is not sufficient accommodation in the girls' school for additional pupils. The Commissioners could not sanction a grant for the enlargement of the schoolhouse except on the conditions notified to the manager, namely, that provision must be made for the transfer of the infant boys to the girls' school unless the manager is prepared to appoint an assistant mistress to the boys' school on the occurrence of the first vacancy. The average attendance for the four years up to 1906 showed a steady increase, but last year there was a slight decrease. There is no reason to anticipate that the appointment of an assistant mistress would cause a lowering of the attendance. Two teachers and a monitor are at present employed in a room measuring thirty-four feet by nineteen feet. The Commissioners cannot entertain the manager's application except on the terms notified to him.

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants on the Grehan Estates.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have considered the applications of Miss Hannah Clahane, Michael O'Regan, and Patrick Hannan for reinstatement in their holdings on the Grehan estate, Kildorrery, county Cork; if the farms formerly held by these tenants are now in the occupation of Mr. John J. Sherry, who resides at Mooresfoot, county Tipperary, over twenty miles distant, and that the farms are merely used as accommodation land, without an acre of tillage; and whether, under these circumstances, the Commissioners will consider the necessity of applying the compulsory powers they possess to effect the reinstatement of the evicted tenants in question.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have considered the applications in question, and have decided to take no action in the case of Patrick Hannan. In the other two cases the former holdings are held by judicial tenants, and the Commissioners consider that the compulsory provisions of the Evicted Tenants Act are not applicable in such cases. The Commissioners, however, will consider the applications in those cases in connection with the distribution of any untenanted land which they may acquire in the locality.

Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milkshops (Ireland) Order, 1908.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received numerous resolutions from public boards and public meetings recently held in Ireland, protesting against the general Order of the Local Government Board respecting dairies, cowsheds, and milk shops; and whether he will defer the enforcement of the order until the objections to portions of it have been reconsidered and dealt with.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) A comparatively small number of resolutions taking exception to the Order has been received. The Local Government Board afforded to all local authorities the fullest opportunity of considering the terms of the order, a draft of it having been circulated in August last with a view to elicit their opinions. Any points made by local authorities were carefully considered, and certain modifications were made in the draft Order before its adoption in February. The Order came into operation on 1st May, and it would be undesirable to take any steps which would impede the local authorities in giving effect to it.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to a resolution of the Milford Rural District Council protesting against The Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milkshops (Ireland) Order, 1908, made by the Local Government Board, and representing that if enforced in their district it will occasion great hardship to the small farmers, who are not in a position to make the required structural alterations or generally to carry out the demands made by the Order; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board received the resolution in question, and in reply thereto the Board pointed out to the council that it was their duty to arrange for the registration of cowkeepers, dairymen, and purveyors of milk within their district, but, seeing that only a small dairying business is carried on there, the Board indicated that the work of inspection might be performed by the sanitary sub-officers instead of by specially appointed dairy inspectors. The Board have reason to believe that only a few farmers in this district who habitually sell milk or supply milk to a creamery will be affected by the Order.

Payment of Irish Education Grants.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if it is the intention of the National Board of Education to pay the proposed grant by capitation; and, if so, will he urge the Commissioners to pay all capitation grants quarterly instead of annually.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It is intended that capitation should enter into the distribution of the grant. The Commissioners consider that it would not be practicable to pay the capitation grants quarterly.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY COUNCILS) BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said he would like someone in charge of the Bill to give the House a little information about it.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present. House counted; and, forty Members being found present,—

SIR F. BANBURY said that as he was not a member of the Standing Committee he had not had an opportunity of ascertaining whether the Bill had been altered in Committee. This appeared to him to be another measure which had been substituted entirely for the original Bill.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch) said that no such change had been made by the Committee upstairs.

Bill read the third time and passed.

INCEST BILL.

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [26th June], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL.

Not amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

SIR F. BANBURY moved in Clause 1, after "thereof," to add: "Provided that the local authority, within the meaning of the same section in the City of London, shall be the mayor, aldermen, and commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled." He said that in London and other boroughs the polling districts had generally been arranged by the justices of the peace, but the county council was the authority promoted by this Bill. The position in the City differed materially from that in all the metropolitan boroughs. The justices in the City were practically the same authority as the municipality, and the Bill therefore proposed to deprive the City of one of its ancient rights. The City being a place of business, with a large number of banks in it, it was very necessary to have an intimate knowledge of it in order that its business arrangements might not be disturbed on polling days. No useful object could be served by altering the arrangements in the City which up to the present had worked extremely well. The London County Council could not know anything about these matters, and it would be a great mistake to alter an arrangement which had gone on for the last 300 or 400 years in order to substitute a body which had not the interest or the knowledge to carry out such work.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) seconded. Personally he could not see why this business should not be left to the City. It had been well managed by them in the past, and he did not know any reason why the House should do anything in the direction of destroying self-government in the City. He hoped the House would agree to allow the City of London to manage its own affairs in its own way.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 13, after the word 'thereof' to insert the words 'provided that the local authority, within the meaning of the same section in the City of London, shall be the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.'"—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. A. ALLEN said that this question was raised in the Standing Committee, a good deal of opposition was offered to the proposal, and the Amendment was eventually withdrawn. Since that time the London County Council, in deference to the views of a deputation from the City of London, had decided not to offer any opposition to the Amendment. In these circumstances he could not oppose it.

*MR. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.) said the circumstances of this question were rather peculiar. When the Bill was read a second time there was no question raised about any differentiation of the position of the City of London. On the Committee this proposal was made but rejected. Now the Bill came before the House of Commons and the proposal was again made. For years no progress had been made with this measure in this House until this year, but it had passed through the House of Lords on three different occasions, and speaking subject to correction he believed the proposal to exclude the City was not inserted. Now at the last moment this proposal to exclude the City was again brought forward.

SIR F. BANBURY said the Committee which rejected the Amendment was not a Select Committee, but a small Standing Committee consisting of only a few members.

*MR. DICKINSON said the same proposal was brought forward before the Standing Committee and withdrawn. The proposal was that the City of London should be left out of a general scheme for the division of London boroughs into polling districts. He did not think the House had yet been made fully aware of the actual proposals which the Bill contained. Under the Registration Acts the duty of dividing the polling districts was given to the magistrates, in Petty Sessions in those cases where the Petty Sessional Divisions were absolutely coterminous with the Parliamentary borough whilst in all other cases it was relegated to Quarter Sessions. By the Local Government Act, 1888, the functions of Quarter Sessions were transferred to the county council. Hence it came about that when the London County Council set to work they found that some of the London boroughs were coterminous with the Petty Sessional Divisions and there the magistrates at Petty Sessions had to carry out the duty of dividing their area into polling districts. Where the boroughs were not coterminous that duty was with the London County Council. Consequently, the London County Council exercised jurisdiction over certain parts of London and the magistrates over other parts. The matter was further complicated by the fact that the Local Government Act of 1888 placed the duty of dividing the whole of London, including the City, into polling districts for the election of the members of the London County Council in the hands of the County Council alone. Now, the electoral divisions for the election of the members of the London County Council were defined by the Act of 1888 as being the same as the divisions for the

Parliamentary elections. When the London County Council were settling the polling districts for all London for the purposes of their own election, including the City, they found that for the purposes of Parliamentary elections they had not got the power to settle the polling districts in certain of the Metropolitan boroughs. That being found very unsatisfactory the present proposals before the House were made years ago and had ever since been awaiting solution. He did not wish to argue the question of the expediency of the Bill, because it was clear that it must be to the public advantage that these particular duties should be performed by one authority and not by two. That being granted the question arose why should a special exception be made for the City. The hon. Baronet had argued that the City contained a good many important business houses. His reply to that argument was that there were a great many important businesses in other parts of London. If the City of London was excluded it was perfectly clear that the other boroughs which had hitherto been divided into polling districts by the justices of petty sessions ought also to be excluded. According to this Amendment the right solution was that each division should not be in the hands of the London County Council at all, but in the hands of the Metropolitan borough councils. That was a proposition for which there was a good deal to be said although he did not think it was so expedient as the proposals in the Bill, but if the City was to be excluded the same principle ought to be applied to all the other London boroughs which were in the same position. The change proposed by the Amendment went a great deal further than the House appreciated. Not only would it exclude the City of London from the general scheme, but it would change the system in the City itself, since it would transfer a power from the magistrates of the City to the Common Council. He hoped the House would not make the very considerable change proposed in the Amendment. He felt certain that had it been known that a proposal which was rejected by the Committee was going to be accepted by the promoters of the Bill, who had themselves urged forcible arguments against it when in Committee, those who were opposed to it would have come to the House prepared to resist the Amendment. He asked the House to agree with its own Committee and not be subject to an agreement come to between the London County Council and the City Corporation outside the House, and since the Bill was before that Committee.

MR. GUINNESS (Bury St. Edmunds) hoped the House would accept the Amendment. He opposed the proposal in Committee, but since then the City Corporation had met the London County Council and the matter had been thoroughly gone into. It was felt that it was not advisable that two authorities of such importance should quarrel over a small point like this. There was apparently a strong feeling in the City about the matter. The hon. Member had said that if they made an exception in the case of the City, it would have to be done also in the case of the boroughs. He did not agree with that. The City Corporation at present exercised functions which were generally carried out by county councils. The City Council had authority over pauper lunatics, explosives, coroners, and weights and measures. When they were giving this new duty to the County Council, it was advisable in the interest of the smooth working of local government to give these powers to the City also. There was a very strong argument against the suggestion of the hon. Member to transfer to the City Corporation the powers which were at present in the hands of petty sessions. For one thing, all the magistrates in the City were members of the City Corporation, and in addition to that it was extremely doubtful what the law in the City was at present. There was very great doubt who was the proper authority to divide the City for the purpose of Parliamentary elections, and therefore, it was undesirable that the law should be left in its present rather obscure state. In this matter there was no question of any trouble between the County Council and the City Corporation. As long as the County Council were informed of any change in the polling arrangements made by the City no trouble could possibly arise.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland) said that as the law now stood the London County Council was the authority for dividing a borough into polling districts only when the borough was situated in more than one petty sessional division. Where a borough was wholly situated in one petty sessional division the justices were the authority. This obviously was an anomalous survival of an ancient system. This Bill, promoted by the County Council, proposed that the County Council should be the authority throughout London for dividing the boroughs into polling districts for Parliamentary purposes as for London County Council elections. The hon. Baronet opposite now proposed that a special exception should be made in the case of the City, and that this power should be placed in the hands of the City Corporation. The hon. Baronet said that that should be done in order not to deprive the City of an ancient right. This was not one of the ancient rights of the City Corporation. There were some people who thought that the City Corporation possessed powers which might with advantage be curtailed, but this Bill did not raise that question at all. It was not a question of the Corporation *v.* the County Council, because the aldermen of the City of London did not act in this matter as the Corporation, but because they were justices of the City, just as the justices in other London boroughs acted on behalf of those boroughs. There was no power in the hands of the Corporation *qua* Corporation to deal with the matter. The power which the hon. Baronet proposed to confer was a completely new power never yet in the hands of the City Corporation. It seemed to him that if they passed the Amendment, they would perpetuate an anomaly for no good reason. If they gave to the City Corporation these exceptional powers, either the polling districts would be the same for Parliamentary and County Council elections or they would not. If they were the same, why should the City Corporation object to the London County Council fixing the polling districts for both? If they were not the same, it was obvious that confusion would arise and people would not know where to vote. The hon. Member for Bury St. Edmunds took that view in Committee, and on behalf of the Government he himself had had no hesitation in supporting him. The Amendment now before the House was the only one moved in Committee. It was moved by the hon. Member for Aston Manor, and after discussion, the Committee were unanimously against it, and the Amendment was withdrawn. Now the hon. Member came to the House to-day and asked them to reverse the decision of the Committee. The hon. Member gave two reasons. One was that it was a bad thing for two local authorities in London to quarrel. In other words, the County Council had surrendered to the City. The second reason was that the City had power to deal with pauper lunatics, explosives, coroners, and weights and measures. He was at a loss to know why that should empower the City Corporation to divide its area for Parliamentary polling purposes differently from the way in which it was divided by the County Council for County Council elections. In view of the facts that there were no ancient rights of the Corporation here involved, and that good administration and good legislation required that only one authority should divide this area for local and Parliamentary elections, he would vote against the Amendment if it went to a division.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said that when a private Bill was brought forward the promoters might be supposed to know their own business. In Committee the promoters would not agree to the Amendment now before the House, but now they came forward and said they were willing to accept it.

MR. A. ALLEN said that in the absence of the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill he merely stated that the London County Council would not oppose the Amendment. His personal views were directly opposed to the Amendment.

MR. RAWLINSON said that if the hon. Member supported an Amendment to which he was opposed, that was entirely a matter for his own conscience. He had often been surprised at hon. Members taking that course, but he did not intend to say anything further on that. When one accepted an Amendment which he had formerly opposed, it was no doubt because, on a balance of considerations, he had reasons for changing his mind, but surely the House ought to be told what the reasons were.

MR. A. ALLEN said he simply stated in the regrettable absence of the hon. Member in charge of the Bill that the County Council offered no opposition to the Amendment. He deliberately abstained from explaining his own views. He thought it would have been unfair to do so in the absence of the hon. Gentleman.

MR. RAWLINSON said he did not mean to say anything to offend the hon. Gentleman. Whatever his own private views were, he now came forward and on behalf of the promoters of the Bill accepted an Amendment which they opposed in Committee. When the promoters of a private Bill came forward and accepted an Amendment, surely the House ought to accept it or reject the Bill, as the case might be. But then the Government stepped in and said practically that the Amendment was one which the House ought to reject. He thought that in dealing with a private Member's Bill, the Government should not bring pressure on its supporters to vote one way or the other, but should leave it to the judgment of the House. He was not in a position to speak on behalf of the City of London, but he had had the privilege of residing in it for over a quarter of a century. As an inhabitant, he should support the Amendment, because he believed that the internal affairs of the City were exceedingly well managed from the point of view of people who lived within its boundaries. No doubt there were some districts, such as the Temple, where the arrangements were difficult to deal with, but these had been exceedingly well carried out, and the other administration of the City had been of the highest kind. For these reasons he hoped the House would agree to the Amendment.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) said that as a London Member he should support what had fallen from the hon. Member for St. Pancras. A drawback to London administration had been the want of uniformity, and anything which tended to accentuate separate authorities ought to be deprecated. The County Council had already the power to control their own elections in the City, and there was no reason why they should not also control the Parliamentary elections. With reference to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Bury St. Edmunds, although this and other Bills had been promoted by independent parties in the County Council, both sides had agreed to it. The particular Amendment moved by the hon. Baronet had by no means been accepted by the County Council. A minority strongly objected to it, because they wanted the procedure throughout London to be uniform. The Bill as it stood was passed unanimously by the Committee upstairs, and it was a pity that this disturbing element should have been introduced at the last moment. He hoped the Amendment would be rejected.

SIR F. BANBURY said that the Under-Secretary for the Home Office had stated that the Amendment proposed to confer a new power upon the City Corporation *qua* City Corporation, but he would point out that the power was now vested in the aldermen acting as justices, and that the form of his Amendment was adopted at the request of the Government draftsman. He thought it was a little hard that a form of words which had been adopted to suit the requirements of the Government draftsman should be denounced by the representative of the Government. The County Council was the existing authority in such Metropolitan boroughs as were situated in more than one petty sessional division. That was evidently because of the overlapping of two different authorities, and was a reasonable course to adopt. But there was no overlapping in the City, and there was no reason why the aldermen of the City should not have this privilege which they had had for a considerable number of years. The fact that the County Council had the power to arrange the whole of the polling districts for their own election had nothing to do with the polling districts in the City for Parliamentary elections.

MR. GUINNESS said that the Under-Secretary for the Home Office must admit that the City occupied a unique position, and as there was a strong feeling in the City in regard to this matter, he thought it was hardly worth while to oppose the suggestion made in the Amendment. He had made inquiries and found that no inconvenience had been caused in the past by the powers existing at present in the Corporation as to the arrangement of the polling districts, and that the fullest information in regard thereto had been given by the City Corporation to the London County Council. He thought that in view of the ancient privileges of the City and the sentimental feeling regarding them, the House might accept the Amendment proposed by the hon. Baronet.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 26 ; Noes, 93. (Division List No. 162.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt HnSirAlex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Barrie,T.H.(Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Coates,Major E. F. (Lewisham
Gretton, John
Hill, Sir Clement
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood,Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry(Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Frederick Banbury, and Mr. Guinness.

NOES.

Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brigg, John
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cleland, J. W.
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C H (Sssex,E.Grinst'd)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Elibank, Master of
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harrington, Timothy
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Roberts,Charles H.(Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H.(Denbighs
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Sheehy, David
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Thorne, G. R.(Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walsh, Stephen
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Dickinson, and Mr. Hart-Davies.

Motion made, and Question proposed, That the Bill be read the third time."

SIR F. BANBURY said that before the Third Reading was taken he would like to point out that the House was in a very unusual position. This was a private Bill in regard to which the promoters agreed to a certain arrangement. The form of that arrangement was modified to suit the Government draftsman, and then a member of the Government came down to the House and objected to the form in which it had been put by the Government draftsman and advised the House not to accept it. The result was that the Members who were not in the House and knew nothing of the matter, came to the door of the House when the division was called and asked which way they were to vote, and because a member of the Government, not speaking with the voice of the Government, came down and said he objected to this form, they voted against it. It showed the utter absurdity of legislating on a Friday afternoon. Here was a point upon which the City Corporation and the London County Council were agreed, yet neither of those important bodies were allowed to have its way, because a member of the Government chose to form a private opinion and influenced a sufficient number of his Party against the arrangement. It would be useless for him to oppose the Third Reading, but he trusted that in another place, where logic prevailed and agreements were respected, the Amendment would be inserted.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

LAW OF DISTRESS AMENDMENT BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

MR. RAWLINSON moved to omit Clause 1. He thought the House ought to know something of the reasons for it before passing a Bill of this kind. At the present time a landlord had power if a tenant was in arrear to seize any property on the premises and sell it under distress. It was sometimes felt that injustice was done where another person had goods in the house of the person in arrear with his rent, because if the landlord came down and seized those goods the person to whom they belonged must either pay the rent or allow his goods to go. There was an exception to that rule in the case of a lodger who had paid his rent up to date, and if the Bill only extended that exception in the direction of its being applied to *bona fide* under-tenants he would not oppose it. The Bill, however, went further. It exempted the property of other people. In the case of a father and son, the latter was neither a lodger nor an under-tenant, but he was living in the house. If his furniture was to be exempt from distress it might have two effects. Such a law would open the door to fraud, because the father would be able to say the furniture belonged to his son either by purchase or by gift. That was the first objection. The second was that in every case there would be a great temptation to say it was harsh to the stranger whose goods were on the premises. That was a misleading argument because the persons really injured by making the law of distress too easy as in the case of this Bill was not the landlord but the tenant. In the case of owners of large areas of house property the only effect of exempting certain of the property in those houses from the law of distress would be to make the landlord harsh in his terms in order to cover the risk. In the case of the owners of small property, and there were many such in this country, who probably would not be found to act harshly, but who might be induced to levy distress earlier than they otherwise would—in that case great injustice would be done to them by taking away the power they now had, which on the whole had worked well, of distraining on all or any of the goods on the premises and leaving the owner of them, who was armed against the man who had distrained upon the goods, to take his remedy. He submitted that this alteration of the law, though well meant, was undesirable from the point of view of the tenants and that the law had better be left as it now was. He begged to move.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) seconded the Amendment, and observed that the words of the section did not appear to him to be quite clear; they were capable of creating considerable hardship on tenants in houses in populous places.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out Clause 1."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'lodger,' in line 8, stand part of the Bill."

*MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) thought the House was indebted to the hon. Members for raising this question, and it was right that they should have an opportunity of hearing the matter discussed, although it was thoroughly discussed in Committee. The hon. and learned Gentleman had correctly laid down that the position of a landlord as a creditor was more favourable than that of a creditor in another trade, because he could take the goods of anybody else which he found on his premises, besides those of his debtor. That had given rise to great hardship, and gradually, wherever such a case had arisen it had been whittled away either by decisions or by statute, but those decisions had been given upon no general principle. The special case of hardship which led to the introduction of this Bill was that of a gentleman, named Robinson, who was the ground landlord of Willis's Rooms, which he let to a company for a very high rent of £1,200 or £1,300 a year, and that company sub-let a part of the premises as a club to a Mr. Challoner. One of the objects of the club was to encourage the sale of works of art by inviting artists to send their pictures there in order that they might have periodical exhibitions, and then perhaps unknown artists would have an opportunity of being brought out. The ground landlord allowed the rent of his immediate tenants to fall into arrear, and of course Mr. Challoner had no opportunity of knowing that. He invited an exhibition of pictures at his club, and a number of artists sent in their pictures to the club. When the exhibition was at an end and the owners were going to take their pictures away, down came Mr. Robinson and said: "I will take every one of these pictures for that rent which, by my own negligence, I have allowed to fall into arrear," and he did so. That was a great hardship. It was immediately followed by a similar case at the Earl's Court Exhibition. An exhibition was held there of Paris dresses, and a number of people sent models over and paid every penny of the rent due in respect of their stalls, and when they were going to take them away at the end of the exhibition down came the ground landlord and said he would sell them all for the rent which he had allowed his immediate tenant to fall in arrear with. There was also an extraordinary case mentioned by the Attorney-General during the discussion of the Bill in Committee, of a friend of his who was driving in his motor car in the country. It broke down, and a kindly individual said: "Put it in my coach-house until you have had it mended." He did that, but when he came back for it, he found that the landlord had taken the motor car in distress for the rent. Everybody was agreed that some alteration ought to be made to prevent that sort of thing, and the way in which he proposed to make an alteration was to take the principle of the Lodger's Goods Protection Act, which he thought was a very reasonable principle. That principle and the principle of this Bill was that each person's goods should be liable for every penny which he owed in respect of the premises, but should not be liable for what was owed by anybody else. He had drafted the Bill himself, but a private Member was not in so favourable a position for carrying through a Bill as the Government, and, therefore, when one had to carry a Bill through, practically by common consent, it must be something which was really felt to be a great hardship. He quite agreed to some of his friend's observations, and he had tried to be very careful not to open the door to fraud, for care had been taken that the Bill was not to be made an instrument of fraud. One found that, unfortunately, the very happy relationship of marriage had been made a shocking instrument of fraud as against creditors, and, therefore, he did not allow a tenant whose rent was in arrears to shield himself behind his wife. The clause had been drawn with a view to preventing in any case the tenant escaping from the payment of his rent by fraud. He offered in Committee and was willing now to accept any Amendment which was necessary to make the clause watertight, and he saw that there were a couple of Amendments down in the name of the hon. Member for Kingston. He was not sure they were necessary, but he was willing that they should be put in.

Amendment negatived.

MR. RAWLINSON said he need only formally move tha Amendment on the Paper, in view of what the last speaker had said. The Amendment dealt with the exemption of certain goods from the effect of the Act. Bills of sale and hire purchase agreements were well-known business documents which did not require protection.

MR. STAVELEY-HILL seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 26, after the word 'any,' to insert the words 'bill of sale, hire purchase agreement, or.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HERBERT said he was quite willing to accept the Amendment. He did not think the words were necessary, but they did no harm.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir S. EVANS, Glamorganshire, Mid.) said he quite agreed with the criticism as to the method of drafting a Bill by reference, and he suggested that after this Bill became law the promoters should incorporate in one Act the Lodgers Goods Protection Act, 1871, and this Act, so that no reference need be in this Act to any other Act.

SIR F. BANBURY said he gathered that the hon. Member in charge of the Bill was prepared to insert the clause standing in the name of the hon. Member for Hoxton in another place. Was that so?

MR. HERBERT: Yes.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

SIR F. BANBURY moved to leave out from the word "where," in page 1, line 5, to the word "a," in line 6, and to insert the words "a Court of summary jurisdiction is satisfied by evidence produced before it that." The Bill as it stood now provided that where in the opinion of a Court of summary jurisdiction a married man was an habitual drunkard, certain things might ensue. He proposed to insert those words so that it would read that when a Court was satisfied by evidence produced before it that a married man was an habitual drunkard, certain things would ensue. Considering the large powers given to a Court if they came to the opinion that a man was an habitual drunkard, he thought the Court, before arriving at that opinion, should hear evidence, and that the man should be allowed to produce evidence to prove that he was not an habitual drunkard. Unless that was done, injustice might arise. It had always been held that a man should be considered innocent until he was proved guilty. If exceptional powers were put into the hands of the Court of summary jurisdiction, the onus of proof should rest exactly in the same manner as it rested in regard to other offences. It might be held, though having consulted one or two legal authorities, he was not quite certain whether it would be so, that the clause already expressed the meaning which he desired to see carried out. He did not, however, think that it did. He had read the Licensing Act of 1892, which dealt with a similar case, and he found there a form of words inserted to ensure that the Court would have evidence brought before it. Even if the clause did carry out his meaning, he did not think there could be any objection to the alteration he proposed. It would make it quite clear that the clauses did carry out the object he had in view. He did not know who was in charge of the Bill. He did not see any of the Members present whose names were on the back of it.

MR. HERBERT SAMUEL: No; they are not.

SIR F. BANBURY asked whether it was in order to move a Bill in the absence of those Members whose names were on the back of it. He had always understood that under the rules introduced in 1902, the power of moving a Bill was taken away from any Member of the House who was not associated with it. He raised this as a point of order.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Question has been put. I did not observe that there was no Member in charge of the Bill present. I do not think that anybody did move the Bill.

SIR F. BANBURY: Perhaps I had better move the adjournment of the debate.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the better plan would be to ask if anybody does move this Order which stands on the Paper. I ask whether any hon. Member does move it.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): I beg to move.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present. House counted—

MR. SPEAKER: There not being forty Members present, I now leave the Chair until such time as there may be.

The sitting was resumed at Two o'clock, Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.

SIR F. BANBURY said that when the sitting was suspended he was urging that his Amendment should be adopted, in order to ensure that a Court of summary jurisdiction should necessarily have evidence before it before branding a man as an habitual drunkard. He did not wish to cast any discredit upon Courts of summary jurisdiction either in Ireland or any other part of the country, but merely to say, without having it clearly expressed in the Bill, that evidence should be heard and brought before the Court was an erroneous method of procedure which would not commend itself to anyone. His Amendment would provide that evidence must be brought before the Court to show whether or not the particular person charged was an habitual drunkard. The only case which was anything like a parallel was that of the Licensing Act of 1902 which contained a paragraph giving some latitude to the Court, and that proposal was modified by the insertion of some such words as he now proposed to insert in this Bill. His difficulty was that he did not know who was in charge of the Bill, and he did not even know who was going to reply to his proposal. He begged to move.

MR. STANIER (Shropshire, Newport) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 5, to leave out from the word 'where' to the word 'a,' in line 6, and to insert the words 'a Court of summary jurisdiction is satisfied by evidence produced before it that.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. REDMOND BARRY, Tyrone, N.) expressed the opinion that the Amendment might well be accepted.

MR. MOONEY (Newry) protested against the Bill being proceeded with in view of the fact that of the hon. Members who had placed their names on the back of it not one had taken the trouble to attend the sitting. It was not treating the House with respect, and he doubted whether they ought to proceed with the Bill under the circumstances.

MR. GODFREY BARING (Isle of Wight) thought the absence of all the hon. Members whose names appeared on the back of the Bill so extraordinary a circumstance that he moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. WALKER (Leicestershire, Melton) seconded the Motion.

SIR F. BANBURY said he failed to see why the debate should be adjourned. The House were fortunate in having the presence of the Solicitor-General for Ireland, and all the hon. Members named on the back of the Bill were Unionists, with whose opinion upon any controversial point the hon. and learned Gentleman was not likely to agree. The questions involved were of a legal character. If the Motion for adjournment were carried it would be impossible to discuss the Bill during this session, and a discussion of its provisions was desirable, although he did not think any hon. Member was opposed to the measure.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) hoped the Motion for adjournment would not be pressed. Three of the four hon. Members whose names appeared on the back of the Bill were unable to be present. The noble Lord the Member for Londonderry was attending the annual training of a regiment in which he held a commission, the hon. and learned Member for North Armagh was engaged at the moment upon the Grand Committee on the Irish University Bill, the hon. Member for North Down was seriously ill, and the hon. Member for North Fermanagh was professionally engaged in Ireland.

MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock) thought it would be a great mistake if they did not take advantage of this opportunity to deal with the Bill. He hoped his hon. friend would withdraw his Motion.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) thought it would be disastrous to adjourn the debate at this stage. He was sure that the hon. Member's Motion was not directed against the Bill, and he appealed to him to allow it to proceed. The fact that it was moved by a Member of the Nationalist Party showed that the measure was not controversial.

MR. MOONEY said that nearly all the Amendments were of a purely legal character, and it was not fair to hon. Members to discuss them without a single hon. Member present representing the party who introduced the Bill. He observed that the Member for the University of Dublin had just entered the House, and that altered the position somewhat and made him rather inclined to proceed with the Bill.

MR. GODFREY BARING asked leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted in the Bill.

SIR F. BANBURY moved an Amendment designed to protect "anything purchased by her with such earnings or property," thereby omitting the words in the clause "or directed by her to be purchased." He contended that the inclusion of these words in the clause would lead to endless confusion. All that was needed was that a person should say, "I have purchased the article, and I pay for it out of my own money."

MR. STANIER seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out from the word 'her,' to the word 'with' in line 13.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed; "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. MOONEY asked whether the Solicitor-General for Ireland accepted this Amendment. He thought the words were unnecessary, and would only lead to complications. They raised the whole question of the law of agency and would lead to a long legal argument as to authority.

O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Reddy, M.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay,T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Sloan and Mr. Hazleton.

NOES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Barrie, H. T.(Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Hill, Sir Clement
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Tuke, Sir John Batty

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Stanier.

SIR F. BANBURY moved to leave out the words "acting by the direction of the board of guardians." He presumed that the board of guardians met not more than once a week, and his Amendment contemplated the avoidance of delay.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, to leave out the words 'acting by the direction of the board of guardians.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. REDMOND BARRY said it was desirable that the relieving officer should have power to act from time to time, and very often hurriedly. On all occasions the relieving officer would be eventually answerable to his employers. He thought that the omission of these words would be better.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, to leave out from the word 'where' to the word 'a' in line 6, and to insert the words 'a Court of summary jurisdiction is satisfied by evidence produced before it that.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Proposed words there inserted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 9, after the words 'of any person,' to insert the word 'or.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question, "That the word 'or' be there inserted," put, and negatived.

SIR F. BANBURY moved to omit the words "or thing" from the clause which imposed penalties on persons who being drunk while "in charge of any person, animal, or thing" endangered the life or limb of any person. He hoped the hon. and learned Member, the Solicitor-General for Ireland, would be able to explain what was the meaning of the word "thing." He defied any Member to get up and say off-hand what was the meaning of "thing." If a motor car or something moved by mechanical traction was meant, by all means the intention ought to be clearly expressed. He had never heard of the word "thing" being used in an Act of Parliament before, and Parliament ought not to adopt such uncertain language in its legislation. He had not looked up the dictionary to see, but he thought that a very large number of different interpretations would be given of what a "thing" was.

MR. MOONEY seconded the Amendment. They were all agreed that it was hard to say what was meant by a person being in charge of a "thing." He suggested that the Solicitor-General for Ireland might consider whether he could find a suitable word to carry out the meaning intended by "thing" and insert it at another stage, or that the word should be dropped out altogether. The expression was far too general and ought to be limited in some way or another.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 10, to leave out the words 'or thing.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or thing' stand part of the Bill."

Mr. REDMOND BARRY thought that the meaning of the clause was very plain, and it should have the very widest scope possible. He was unable to give a comprehensive definition of the words "or thing," but they were obviously intended to meet every conceivable case where a person got drunk when in charge of timber, animals, motor cars, bicycles, or anything else. The word "thing" itself was to be often found in Acts of Parliament, and he thought it was desirable that these words should remain in the Bill unless a more definite phrase was discovered.

Mr. STAVELEY-HILL said that under the clause as it stood it might be made a criminal offence for a person to be drunk in charge of a parcel, a fishing rod, or a walking stick.

Mr. SLOAN thought they might accept the Amendment if they could discover some other words more definite to put in the place of "thing." They should have as wide a word as possible to carry out the intention of the promoters of the Bill; and he would rather have the vague phrase than none at all.

Mr. HAZLETON hoped that the Solicitor-General for Ireland would not agree to the Amendment. The important question was that a person endangered the life or limb of another person, no matter what he was in charge of. If any more suitable word could be found, let it be brought up in another place, but he hoped the present word would be retained at this stage.

Question put, "That the words 'or thing' stand part of the Bill."

The House divided:—Ayes, 124; Noes, 32. (Division List No. 164.)

AYES.

Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Brigg, John
Brunner, J F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Devlin, Joseph
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Elibank, Master of
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gill, A. H.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Idris, T. H. W.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Laidlaw, Robert
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Menzies, Walter
Morrell, Philip
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Murnaghan, George
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rees, J. D.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)

White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Hazleton and Mr. Sloan.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hunt, Rowland
Kerry, Earl of
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Stanier, Beville
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Staveley-Hill.

SIR F. BANBURY moved to amend Clause 10 by leaving out the words "appears to be thought to be," and inserting the word "is." He had moved a similar Amendment to Clause 1, earlier in the day, and that Amendment was accepted. This Amendment he had taken from the Act of 1902, and he was certain that he would receive the support of hon. Members from Ireland, because by the Amendment he was endeavouring to put Ireland on the same footing as England. Clause 2 of the Act of 1902 was practically identical with this clause, and related to persons being found drunk in charge of a child, and who might be apprehended if the child was under that age. He begged to move.

MR. MOONEY expressed the hope that this Amendment would be accepted by the Committee. He therefore begged to second it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 21, to leave out the words 'appears to be thought to be,' and insert the word 'is.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. REDMOND BARRY agreed with the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he wished to move as an addition to Clause 11 words which would prevent the application of the extraordinary provisions in that section to an innocent person. If hon. Members looked at the clause they would find that it created a new and rather novel offence. It made it an offence for any person to aid or abet any man who was already drunk to get drink, or to aid or abet that man in consuming that drink. Those who were acquainted with the discussions which had taken place on the Licensing Acts would know that there had been endless litigation with regard to whether there was any previous knowledge. This would be, he thought, a very severe law indeed, because it would impose the penalty of imprisonment upon any member of the public who, without knowing the condition of the man, gave drink or supplied it to a man who had already had more than enough. It was not always easy to determine when a man was drunk. Some men could conceal that fact with much greater skill than others. It would be a very great injustice indeed if any man should be deemed guilty of this offence unless he knew or ought to have known the condition of the man. It was for this reason that he desired to insert these words. It was a proper Amendment and should meet the object of the promoters of the Bill. As the clause now stood, if A had supplied B or assisted B to get drink, and B was drunk at the time, although A did not know it, a conviction must follow as a matter of course. He begged to move.

MR. MOONEY hoped the Amendment would be accepted. He did not think the promoters of the Bill could refuse it. The clause, as it stood, was of a most penal character. The Court, he thought, should always take evidence on the point of whether the man if he did not know ought to have known. While he was anxious to assist the Bill and help it through, he thought the Amendment should be accepted, and therefore seconded it.

Amendment proposed—

"At the end of Clause 11, to add the words 'Provided always that no person shall be liable to be convicted under this section unless the Court is satisfied that he knew or ought to have known the condition of the person in connection with whom the charge is brought.' "—(*Mr. James Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln) said he certainly hoped this Amendment would not be accepted. Over and over again Judges had alluded to the word "knowingly," and had described it as a word put into an Act to make a law a dead letter. There was a difference in the Amendment, which proposed that it should be necessary to prove knowledge to exist, or if it did not exist that it ought to have existed. But the difficulty of proving knowledge was always very great, and for that reason he hoped these words would be excluded. If, as a matter of fact, one person supplied drink to another while the other person was drunk it ought to be sufficient when the fact was established in the Courts to secure a conviction. He therefore hoped that the Solicitor-General for Ireland would resist the Amendment.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.) as a friend of the Bill, hoped the Solicitor-General would accept the Amendment. He was not prepared to say what the administration of the licensing law might be in the future, but he asked those who, like himself, desired to see this Bill become law not to put in its way any unnecessary obstacles.

MR. REDMOND BARRY said he was thoroughly in sympathy with the hon. Member for Lincoln, that there should be no escape for a man who assisted an actually drunken person to obtain drink, but there were occasions, as the right hon. Member for the Dublin University said, when a man who did this could not know that the man was drunk. He thought the words of the Amendment would be an improvement to the clause, and he did not think they would aid any man to escape conviction. He did not think it was the desire of the House of Commons that such a case should come within the scope of the Bill, and he therefore supported the proposed Amendment, because it would prevent a man morally innocent from being penalised by the Court.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) thought it desirable the Amendment should be accepted. His view was very much confirmed by the fact that the Member for Lincoln was against it. They all had a high respect for the views of the hon. Member, but on this question he generally found it safe to oppose what the hon. Member favoured. According to the Report on the Metropolitan Police, there were various stages of drunkenness, and it was plain that the last degree of drunkenness might be consistent with its being quite invisible to an ordinary spectator. As the clause at present stood, anybody who aided and abetted a man who was not sober to get drink committed a criminal offence, and if a man who was not quite sober went into a public-house, and a friend of his ordered him a glass of beer, and another person induced the publican to supply it, they were guilty of a criminal offence, although they might not know that the man was not quite sober.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he most heartily supported this Amendment. There was always a danger of temperance measures being lost by intemperate action on the part of its supporters. If hon. Members from Ireland, whose Bill this was, were satisfied, why should anyone else object? It was enough to make Unionists turn Home Rulers when they found that Irishmen were not allowed to settle these matters for themselves. The late Solicitor-General spoke of a man being drunk without anyone knowing it. There were many people who were drunk from time to time all their lives without anyone else knowing it. He hoped the House would follow the advice given by the Front Benches and accept the Amendment.

*MR. HAZLETON said that, unlike the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone, he supported the Amendment in spite of the fact that the Member for Lincoln was against it. He quite admitted that the word "knowingly" was a word to be fought shy of in this Bill, but it was a word that was not going to be in this Bill. The words "ought to have known" provided a safeguard against any possible danger the hon. Gentleman might have in his mind. If the Court knew that the man was drunk it would assume, unless there were some very extraordinary circumstances, that the friend ought to have known he was drunk. He hoped the Amendment would be accepted.

SIR F. BANBURY said he had intended to move an Amendment on similar lines to this clause, but not having his right hon. friend's knowledge of the law he had again to refer to the Act of 1902, and he was faced with the fact that in that Act Clause 7 was identical with Clause 11 of this Bill. He therefore thought he ought not to move an Amendment which would place Ireland in a superior position to England with regard to the law. His right hon. friend had, however, come forward and moved the Amendment which he would have liked to have seen moved to the Act of 1902, and that being so, although it placed Ireland in a superior position, he should support it.

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) said he desired to support the hon. Member for Lincoln in this matter. Wherever there was restriction there must be danger of evasion, and the difficulties that arose from evasion. What the House had to consider before they passed a restrictive measure was whether it was worth while to do so, having regard to the dangers which accompanied it. This, in his opinion, was the best course for temperance legislation to take. Although much might be done in different ways, the best way was to penalise the drunkard. He thought the Amendment was extremely widely worded. Not only were some people when in drink much more noticeable than others, but there were some very absent-minded people, and it would be difficult to say whether a person knew or should have known that a man was drunk. The only thing to do was to take evidence as to whether the man was drunk or not, and not to take the opinion of a person as to whether they knew he was drunk or not.

MR. GUY BARING (Winchester) said that many persons in the House thought it was a pity that the hon. Gentleman had accepted the Amendment. On this occasion he regretted that he must differ from his hon. friend. If the hon. Member for Lincoln went to a division he should support him.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said he was strongly in favour of the Bill, which was very badly needed. He remembered that when the present Opposition occupied the benches opposite a somewhat similar Bill found great favour with them, and he asked hon. Members to give way upon this matter. He did not think they proposed or wished that any person should incur liabilities under Clause 11 if in fact he had no knowledge of the condition of the man with reference to whom he was charged. He was sure no hon. Gentleman would say in such a case that a man ought to be convicted, but he must be if the clause was left as it was, because if all that could be proved was that A was drunk in fact and that B, whether he knew it or not, was supplying or assisting him in getting drunk, and if B knew nothing of the drunken condition of A, it would be wrong that he should incur criminal liability in respect of that act. He wished to prevent that liability attaching in any case in which the Court was satisfied that the man did not in fact know the condition of the person in connection with whom he was charged. He suggested to hon. Members opposite that they were doing more harm than good if they would not give way on a reasonable proposition of that kind, which he himself had moved with the direct object of facilitating the progress of the measure.

MR. SLOAN hoped hon. Members opposite would withdraw their opposition. The necessity for the Amendment was very great; the Bill had been on the verge of passing once before in that House, and they did not want to see it destroyed now.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS said he still thought it would be better not to have these words in, but he would not press his opposition in view of what had been said.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. RAWLINSON said his Amendment was a matter of technical detail in Clause 13. What he objected to in the clause was that they should compel a wife to give evidence against a husband, and he thought the House would agree with him that that was a good general working rule of jurisprudence. The evils of forcing a woman to give evidence against her husband were well known. If they succeeded in forcing such evidence they put a husband or a wife in a very awkward position, and either they had to commit perjury, which was the more frequent result, or they were very unwilling to have the truth dragged out of them, and then it was difficult to know how far they were keeping to the facts. Unless there was some special cause why this evil practice should be allowed to exist in the Bill, he felt that the promoters might fairly come to the conclusion that they should omit the words in question. The more often a clause of this kind was included, the more and more would it become a customary clause. He moved his Amendment.

MR. MOONEY seconded the Amendment. He thought the old practice of a wife not being allowed to give evidence against her husband, or a husband against his wife, ought to be adhered to. There was no necessity whatever for husband or wife to be made a compellable witness. They had given power to a very large number of people to give evidence before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction; they had the relatives of the person charged, the legal officer, and others, and there was every reason to believe that the necessary evidence would be forthcoming without breaking through the old and sound rule of English law that a wife should not give evidence against her husband or a husband against his wife. He thought the Bill would be quite as strong without these words, if it was simply provided that a husband or a wife should be a competent witness.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 8, to omit the words 'and save when a defendant a compellable.'" —(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. REDMOND BARRY said that the intention of Clauses 1 and 2 was mutually to protect husband and wife, and justice would be secured if it would be possible for a husband or a wife to come forward and give evidence if it was his or her own wish to do so, but he thought it was undesirable to force it upon either the one or the other. He would, therefore, agree to the Amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a third time."

SIR F. BANBURY said he was not hostile to the Bill, and they had had an extremely useful and businesslike discussion; they had made a large number of Amendments, all of which would lead to the useful working of the Bill when it became an Act, but he would like to draw the attention of his noble friend the Member for Marylebone to the fact that in that House they had made a large number of useful Amendments, and that while the Bill was upstairs in Committee all these Amendments were untouched. It was often said that when a Bill had been considered upstairs it was almost like sacrilege for any hon. Member downstairs to presume to amend it. If they had followed that argument they would not have made all these useful Amendments to this Bill, and what had taken place that afternoon was an object lesson to the Government and to the House as showing that the proper place for all these Committee Amendments was in Committee of the whole House.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

EDUCATION (LOCAL AUTHORITIES) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKINNON WOOD, Glasgow, St. Rollox) said he wished to add a clause which was entirely non-controversial, and which would be of great administrative convenience. It did not touch the question of elementary education at all, but only dealt with the powers in regard to higher education of the authorities mentioned in Part II. of the Act of 1902. It had been found that there were so many cases in which the authorities found it convenient to join together in the administration of a school or college that there were many places in which it was done, but express legal sanction to do so would be a great advantage. At present in such cases difficulties arose with regard to the auditing of accounts, and when those difficulties arose difficulties also arose in regard to the payment of grants. The matter was not one on which there was likely to be any difference of opinion, and he hoped the House would assent to the clause which he ventured to move.

New Clause—

"To add the following clause: 'For the purpose of establishing or maintaining any school or college which any council have power to establish or maintain under Part II. of the Education Act, 1902, the council may agree to unite with any other council having powers under that Part of that Act, upon such terms as to payment, the appointment of a joint body of managers, and otherwise, as may be thought proper.'"—(*Mr. McKinnon Wood.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

LORD BALCARRES said that, as the hon. Gentleman had said, the clause he had moved was wholly alien to the Bill before the House.

MR. McKINNON WOOD: I did not make that statement; I think it is very germane to the purposes of this Bill.

LORD BALCARRES said the Bill before the House was the delegation clause of the Bill of 1906. It was called the delegation clause in the marginal note, and it dealt solely with elementary education, and the promoter of this Bill had followed that clause scrupulously, not changing a single word in the introduction, except two or three things necessary owing to the Bill being dealt with in isolation. In his Memorandum he stated specifically that the Bill applied to elementary education alone, and now the Government came forward and introduced what seemed to be rather an objectionable thing, viz., an Amendment of the main Act of 1902 dealing with secondary education, training colleges, and so on, which was wholly distinct from the Bill of 1906, which in itself was no doubt a virtual repeal of the Act of 1902. He had no particular objection to the clause. Anybody at all acquainted with local education authorities knew perfectly well that what was proposed in this clause had already been carried into effect in certain places. He did not know what counties had difficulties about their audits, but the whole question of joint audits was settled by the clause dealing with co-ordination and co-operation in the Act of 1902. If the hon. Gentleman assured him that some question of audit had arisen which had produced an *impasse* between two local authorities maintaining jointly a hostel, training college, or teachers' centre, he would bow to his statement, but he would point out with all respect that it was not the fault of the Act of 1902 that such a condition had arisen, but the fault of one or both of the local education authorities in not having taken the trouble in drawing up a scheme of joint working to determine the ordinary business lines on which their accounts should be kept. He would point out another inconvenience. The Bill did not affect London, and county boroughs also were excluded. Between Lancashire and Yorkshire, where two county boroughs existed close to the borders, it might well be convenient that those two county boroughs should be entitled to work their pupil teachers' centre together just as much as the counties of Suffolk and Norfolk should be allowed to do so. Under this Bill the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education was only by his new clause giving power to establish joint bodies under Part II. of the old Act. If he wanted to enlarge the co-ordination portion of the Act of 1902 he should do it in a comprehensive way, and make it apply all round, and not, by incorporating it with the present Bill, limit it to two counties, and even then to counties with a certain population. Under this clause it would be impossible for Huntingdon, for instance, to take advantage of the scheme. He thought the Parliamentary Secretary would agree with him that if there was any county which required a statutory right to establish joint bodies, it was of all others one like Huntingdon, which had an insignificant population, and might find great difficulty in regard to capital expenditure necessary for erecting a hostel. He did not propose to oppose the Bill, but he would point out that this clause was not germane to it, and was in some ways inconsistent with it, and the fact of its being tacked on to a delegation Bill only dealing with counties did not allow the clause to be carried quite as far as under other conditions it might be made to apply.

MR. WALKER (Leicestershire, Melton) on behalf of the promoters accepted the clause. He pointed out that the Memorandum to which the noble Lord had referred should not have been reprinted, because the Bill was largely amended in Committee, and the Memorandum was not now quite accurate in many respects.

VISCOUNT MORPETH said the object of the new clause seemed to him perfectly right, but the question he would like to ask was why it should be necessary. They all knew that at the present time there were working arrangements between counties and their neighbours, or between county boroughs within their area, with regard to the working of secondary schools. There was every sort of arrangement in existence, and so far as he knew they were working more or less satisfactorily; but the Parliamentary Secretary had told them there were difficulties with regard to the audits. He had no acquaintance with those difficulties, but he assumed the Board had had cases sent up to them in which there had been such difficulties. He would have imagined, without further information, that those difficulties arose from the arrangements made between neighbouring counties or a county and a county borough being defective, and that if the schemes had been properly drawn, or were even now amended, there would be no difficulty of that sort. Why was there need of this clause in view of Clause 20 of the Education Act of 1902, where it said that an authority might make arrangements with the council of a county borough, district, or parish for the exercise by the council, on such terms and subject to such conditions as might be agreed on, of any of the powers of the authority in respect to the management of any school or college within the area of the council. Very wide powers were given under that clause as to management, the proportion of managers or governors to be appointed by each authority, the financial relationships between the two, and the class of schools to be dealt with. That being so, and it being a matter of general knowledge that there were these agreements all over the country, which had been very satisfactory in most cases, he would like to ask the hon. Gentleman why it became necessary to put this new clause in. Though the clause was more or less connected with the Bill it did not deal with the same questions, and it seemed somewhat undesirable that, in these rather complicated questions of administration, which were apt to give rise to a good deal of trouble between authorities and cause much expense, the Government should tack a clause on to a private Bill which had been through so many vicissitudes, and which had been so fundamentally altered upstairs that its parents could hardly recognise it as their original Bill.

MR. HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said he did not know himself why the cases which arose between county councils and county borough councils were not fairly capable of settlement under the old condition of things. He presumed that the hon. Gentleman had reasons for putting down this clause. He had known of arrangements, and worse still of the lack of arrangements, between county councils and county boroughs which caused a considerable amount of inconvenience and expense, but he gathered that his hon. friend's proposal did not cover scuh cases. When he was dealing with the matter why should he not deal with the whole situation? The common case to be dealt with was that of the children of a village which was under the administration of the county council, and where there was not as a rule a very good school existing. His hon. friend did not seem to enable the county councils under this clause to come to an arrangement with the county boroughs. He did not know what his hon. friend meant by the words "what is thought proper." Did that mean that the County Council or borough council was to determine what was "thought proper," or whether the Government Department was to have a voice as to what was "thought proper?" No doubt two great local authorities could settle between themselves, but what was to become of the poor villager who might easily fall between the two stools of the great big county council and the most powerful county borough, when they settled their quarrel, and came to terms of agreement? It might be that some poor villagers would be compelled to send their children to one school or another without their consent. He knew many villages where the parents had desired to send their children to school in the neighbouring county borough, but the county council had stepped in and said "No," and had compelled the parents to send their children to some much smaller school which they had established on their own account rather than pay a few pounds extra to allow them to attend a large school in the neighbouring county borough. It was not only in the interest of the county but in the interest of the neighbouring village, if his hon. friend was going to enable the county authority to come to some arrangement, that it should only be done under the supervision of the Department, and everybody should be considered—not merely the two authorities, who could look after themselves, but also the parents and their children.

Lord R. CECIL thought the Government were ill-advised in drawing up this clause, at any rate, in its present form. There was no use, as far as he could see, in further complicating the law in regard to education. It seemed to him that, in the conditions under which the county councils worked, it was already sufficiently complicated. If anything was desired to improve that machinery, it ought to be done by an amendment of the existing machinery, rather than by superimposing upon it yet another method of combination which he ventured to say had not been sufficiently thought out. His noble friend had referred to Clause 20 of the Act of 1902, but there was another clause which seemed even more directly in point, and with which the hon. Gentleman no doubt was familiar, Clause 17. The House would remember that by the first subsection the Council was given powers to make a scheme for the appointment of an education committee. By subsection (3) provision was made for the constitution of a separate education committee for any area within the county, or for a joint education committee for any area formed of a combination of county boroughs or county districts. There was in the appendix to that Act a code of Regulations to regulate the proceedings of that joint committee. The hon. Gentleman was perfectly right in saying that financial difficulties had arisen with reference to the work of these joint committees, because the Act did not specifically, and in so many words, provide an arrangement by which the expense of the various councils could be apportioned. But that difficulty was by no means insuperable, and could be got over in several instances by an agreement between the two. They had the scheme under the Act, and then they had the agreement with the provision at the end of it that if the agreement was not carried out then the scheme was to come to an end. There was no difficulty about that. He believed himself that there was no real practical difficulty in establishing that joint committee now, but at any rate if there was any amendment of the law it should be by way of amending Clause 17. If they included in this clause a new method of combination they would have, as far as he could see, no machinery for carrying that method of combination into effect. He did not see any provision in the clause as to giving any powers at all to that joint committee. All that they could do was to agree to unite upon such terms as might be thought proper. That was merely an agreement, and he did not see that it gave power to the joint committee of an executive character or even for carrying on its own proceedings. It might be that there was a practical difficulty under the Act of 1902 in delegating any executive powers to the joint committee. He did not pretend to know enough of the detailed work to say, but that might be a matter for amendment, and in that case it would be right to deal with it. But this clause did not deal with it; it merely proposed a new method of combination.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) said he had come to the House with an open mind in regard to this clause, but after listening to the speeches of the two noble Lords on those benches he could not see the necessity of it at all. As far as he could see it was entirely contrary to the principle of the Bill as it originally stood. He quite agreed with the noble Lord the Member for South Birmingham that the change which had been made in this Bill in Committee upstairs was the most remarkable he had ever seen take place in any measure. He could not help thinking that the hon. Gentleman who was in charge of the Bill, and who acted as Chairman of the Committee, must have very great difficulty in recognising his own offspring when he looked at it. The Bill dealt with secondary education only, but he found included in it powers far wider than anything which they had discussed in that House. He could not help thinking, therefore, that it would be wiser if the Government reconsidered their determination, and if his hon. friend went to a division he should certainly support him.

* MR. MCKINNON WOOD said there seemed to be some misapprehension in regard to the Amendment, There had been about fifty cases in which difficulties had arisen. It was therefore a matter of importance to the Board of Education. The clauses referred to in the Education Act of 1902—Clauses 17 and 20—did not deal with the particular cases with which this clause was intended to deal. The clause was intended to deal with cases where there was a school or college used by two areas and in regard to which it was advisable that the two areas should take part in its management and jointly contribute towards its maintenance.

VISCOUNT MORPETH asked if the hon. Member said that it was impossible at the present time for two county councils to appoint a joint body of governors say of a secondary school.

* MR. MCKINNON WOOD said he did not think it was impossible. He had mentioned that the thing had been done a good many times, but the noble Lord would remember the case of Millom in Cumberland in which some difficulty arose. The case which the clause was intended to meet was not at all met by the clauses referred to by the hon. Member. This was a case in which they had a committee of both authorities dealing with a particular institution, and it was a mere question of administration and of accounts. There were many cases in which it was desirable to have power jointly to control and maintain a school or college, and it was so convenient that it had been done, but difficulties had arisen in consequence of questions raised with regard to the audit of the Committee's accounts. This clause, therefore, was not a question of complicating the Education Act of 1902; it was a question of simplification. It would enable two authorities interested in an institution to form a committee to deal with it without having any technical difficulties raised with regard to the audit or to the grant. Clause 17 of the Act of 1902 was, of course, more appropriate to large administrative areas. This clause dealt with particular institutions—schools and colleges.

SIR F. BANBURY said he understood the hon. Gentleman to say that this clause had been brought forward, not because it had been impossible in the past to carry out the object the clause desired to promote, but because there had been technical difficulties raised with regard to the question of audit and grant. The clause, therefore, he said ought to be passed. He was rather inclined to think that on the face of it it was not a bad clause. He was in favour of economy, and he was inclined to think the clause might tend in that direction, and at first he was disposed to support it; but, on further consideration, he had come to the conclusion that the clause was not as innocent as it looked and ought not at the present moment to be supported. The title of the measure was "Education (Local Authorities) Bill," and under that it would be perfectly in order to alter the whole of the Education Act of 1902, and alter it by means of a private Member's Bill. He did not think that was a right thing to do. The Memorandum said that the Bill reproduced the language of the delegation clause of the Education construction of the clause, why was it done? Was it done through inadvertence or bad drafting, or was it not intended, and, if it was not intended, why were they to bring in this wonderful Amendment which was only to apply to county councils, precluding any arrangement being made with the council of a borough of over 10,000.

*MR. MCKINNON WOOD said he could assure the hon. and learned Member that it did not exclude them. It included any council which had powers under Part II. of the Act.

MR. RAWLINSON said that if the hon. Gentleman looked at Part II. he would find that boroughs of the nature he had indicated had no powers under Part II. of the Act.

*MR. MCKINNON WOOD said they had.

MR. RAWLINSON said that was a most extraordinary statement to make. The clause excluded arrangements with the vast majority of boroughs, and he asked whether that was intentional or whether it was a mistake. This power was given to unite "upon such terms as may be thought proper." Thought proper by whom? The question had been asked before, but no answer had been given. In drafting a clause of this kind it ought to be made clear as to who was meant. If it was meant to be the contracting councils, they had only to put in the words. Apart from the drafting of the clause, he protested as well against the Government putting in Amendments on a Friday afternoon in this way. He had protested against it once already, and was assured that the Government might do this sort of thing, and make it in no way a Government clause. They knew the result of that on the last occasion when many Members who took part in the division did not know what they were voting for. He supposed the same would happen again. When the Government supported a clause of this kind it got about among their followers and it was made a party question. He agreed that it applied to all sections of the House, and he dared say that their front bench would do exactly the same, but the back benches should protest against it. He hoped the House would not only object to the clause but would object to the system.

*MR. MCKINNON WOOD said he was very sorry to intervene again, but the hon. Member had appealed to him so very strongly that perhaps he would allow him to point out that Part II. of the Education Act included non-county boroughs and urban districts as well as county councils, and the clause now proposed included all the authorities that had power under Part II.

MR. GODFREY BARING said they had been debating the clause for an hour, and he thought the Government might have followed the course of submitting it to the Standing Committee, of which he was a member. If that had been done probably five or ten minutes would have sufficed for the debate, and the matter would have been ended. He did not think it was treating Committees quite respectfully or fairly, after they had fully considered a Bill of this kind, suddenly to hurl at their heads a new clause introduced by the Government.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, W. R., Thirsk) said he wished as a member of the County Councils Association to state why he proposed to vote for the clause. Though he felt as his hon. friends did with regard to the Amendment being introduced so suddenly at this stage of the proceedings, he recognised that the clause might be, to a certain extent, required for the purposes of audit. He protested however against the way in which it had been brought before the House. The hon. Member who had just sat down spoke as an admirer of the system of Standing Committees, and he spoke as just the reverse, but they had both arrived at the same conclusion, that it was very inconvenient that on the Report stage of a Bill like this a clause should be suddenly sprung upon the House which had not hitherto been considered. It certainly seemed to him when his hon. friend was speaking that the representative of the Board of Education did not seem to know whether it applied to certain urban councils or not.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 153 ; Noes, 40. (Division List No. 165).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Boland, John
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Cullinan, J.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dillon, John
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harrington, Timothy
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helmsley, Viscount
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Maddison, Frederick
Marnham, F. J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Rees, J. D.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Ure, Alexander
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Ridsdale, E. A.
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Stanier, Beville
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Valentia, Viscount
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES,—Mr. Godfrey Baring and Mr. Stanley Wilson.

Clause read a second time.

MR. GODFREY BARING said that some objection had been taken by the hon. Member for Morley to the words "as may be thought proper." The words were very obscure and they would like to know who was to think these arrangements proper, whether the two local authorities or the Board of Education, and in order to render that quite clear he moved to amend the clause by leaving out at the end "and otherwise as may be thought proper," and inserting "that may be sanctioned by the Board of Education."

LORD BALCARRES said he wanted to move at an earlier point a verbal Amendment which he thought should be accepted. It was to insert after "payment" the words "and audit." He understood it was the audit and not the payment on account which caused the difficulty, and he thought it advisable that the specific statement should be inserted.

Amendment proposed to the proposed new clause—

"In line 4, after the word 'payment' to insert the words 'and audit.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. McKINNON WOOD said he was very sorry he could not accept the Amendment, because the effect would be to give the local authorities power to decide what sort of audit they would have. This was a Bill enabling local authorities to combine together in certain ways, and for certain purposes. It did not give them powers in regard to audit, which must remain under the control of the Local Government Board and not of the authority.

And, it being Five of the Clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Wednesday next.

POLLING DISTRICTS AND REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order read for resuming adjourned debate on Amendment [26th June] proposed on consideration of the Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee).

Which Amendment was—

"In page 2, line 9, at the end, to insert the words, '(1) The Lord-Lieutenant in Council may make rules for adapting to the provisions of this Act the enactments relating to the registration of electors in Ireland, and the precepts and forms contained in or used under those enactments.'"—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 11, to leave out from the word 'effect' to end of subsection."—(*Mr. Cherry.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

CORONERS' INQUESTS BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; Bill to be read the third time upon Monday next.

DAYLIGHT SAVING (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

HANDLOOM WEAVING (IRELAND) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following members from the Standing Committee A (in respect of the Access to Mountains Bill): Mr. Boland and Mr. Waldron; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the said Bill): Mr. French and Mr. Augustine Roche.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

Sir GEORGE WHITE reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties concerned, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

ARDS AND BANGOR RAILWAYS BILL.

Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at five minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 6th July, 1908.

VISCOUNT BOYNE.

Report made from the Lord Chancellor that the right of Gustavus William, Viscount Boyne in the Peerage of Ireland, to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to the satisfaction of the Lord Chancellor; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—London County Council (Money).

Also the Certificate that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 11).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—South-West Suburban Water.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Blackburn Corporation Bill; Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 25th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^{a}; agreed to.

Bills read 2^{a} accordingly.

Finchley Urban District Council Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Motherwell Burgh Extension, etc., Bill.—Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Blackburn Corporation Bill.—Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill.—Committed.

Widnes Corporation Bill.—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn; The Orders made on Monday and Wednesday last discharged and Bill committed.

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners.

Bristol Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Cambrian Railways Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with an Amendment: The said Amendment considered and agreed to.

Upton Town Hall Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Blaydon and Ryton Water (Transfer) Bill; Bromley and Crays Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

London and District Electricity Supply Bill [H.L.].—King's Consent and Consent of the Prince of Wales, signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. [No. 130.]

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bill to be read 3^{a} to-morrow.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [H.L.]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [H.L.]; Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a according to order) and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill.—Read 2^a (according to order), and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill.—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed.

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill; River Wandle Protection Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [H.L.]—(Swansea Orders, No. 1 and No. 2), and other Bills do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill, the Blackburn Corporation Bill, and the River Wandle Protection Bill [H.L.]; read, and agreed to. All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the Petitioners praying to be heard by Counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also Counsel for the Bills.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TREATY SERIES, No. 19. (1908).

Notes exchanged between the United Kingdom and Sweden and Norway, relative to the Agreement of 12th July, 1881, for the mutual relief of distressed seamen, November, 1907—May, 1908.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) ACT, 1907.

Return giving particulars of cases in which persons have been reinstated with the assistance of the Estates Commissioners during the quarter ended 31st March, 1908.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Return of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of October, 1907.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Accounts of all deposits received and paid during the year ended 31st December, 1907; together with statement showing the aggregate amount of the liabilities of the Government to depositors in the Post Office Savings Banks on 31st December, 1907, and the nature and amount of the securities held by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to meet those liabilities at that date.

BUILDING SOCIETIES.

Thirteenth Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the proceedings of the registrars under the Building Societies Acts, with an abstract of the annual accounts and statements of societies for the year 1907: Part I. Report.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION SCHEMES, INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES AND TRADE UNIONS.

Reports of the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies for the year ended 31st December, 1907. Part A.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

COMPANIES (CONSOLIDATION) BILL [H.L.].
POST OFFICE CONSOLIDATION BILL [H.L.].
STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [H.L.].

Message from the Commons that they have ordered that the Select Committee appointed by them to join with a Committee of this House to consider the said Bills do meet the Committee appointed by their Lordships in Committee Room A., upon Wednesday next, at Two o'clock, as proposed by this House.

LOCAL REGISTRATION OF TITLE (IRELAND) AMENDMENT BILL (No. 122).

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY COUNCILS) BILL (No. 123).

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed.

INCEST BILL (No. 124).

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL (No. 125).

POLICE (SUPERANNUATION) BILL (No. 126).

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL (No. 127).

POLLING DISTRICTS AND REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) BILL (No. 128).

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed.

LAW OF DISTRESS AMENDMENT BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday the 14th instant. [No. 129]

MISSING BRITISH SHIPS.

LORD MUSKERRY rose "To call attention to the fact that the Board of Trade have not ordered formal investigations into the circumstances attending the losses of the missing steamers "Neptune" and "Grindon Hall"; to ask the reason, or reasons, for this; whether a preliminary inquiry has been held in regard to the "Neptune," and, if so, by whom; and why, in the case of the "Grindon Hall," a preliminary inquiry was conducted in private by the Cardiff Stipendiary, assisted by a nautical assessor, instead of, as usual, by the Collector of Customs: also, to move 'That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in every case where a British ship is posted as missing and given up as lost, a public investigation should, when practicable, be ordered by the Board of Trade in order, if possible, to elicit any material facts which might tend to throw light on the probable cause of the disaster.'"

The noble Lord said: My Lords, the matter to which my Notice refers is one of serious moment, and well worthy of your Lordships' careful consideration. The tragedy of a missing ship and the unknown fate of her crew is, unfortunately, not uncommon, and it is an occurrence which we all deplore when we hear of it. In justice to the men who have gone to their doom in such a way, and, even more so, in justice to the widows, orphans, or other dependants they may have left behind, it is our bounden duty to cause public investigation into such disasters. We should probe matters to the bottom in order that we may assure ourselves that every possible safeguard was adopted on the sailing of the vessel, and that she was in a thoroughly seaworthy condition previous to her departure on her ill-fated voyage.

The Merchant Shipping Act provides us with all the necessary machinery for this, and a very large amount of public money is expended annually in investigating casualties to British merchant ships. A disaster to a merchant ship is a matter of public interest. Safety of life at sea is a question which should concern us all. If it is necessary that a formal public investigation—commonly known as a Board of Trade inquiry—should be held into a case of stranding or of collision, how much more is it necessary that a similar investigation should be held openly and publicly when a British ship is missing with all her crew? A public inquiry is necessary in such a case, if only for the purpose of establishing public confidence and allaying what might be most unjustifiable suspicions and misapprehensions certain to arise in the case of missing ships.

Yet I am astonished so find that the Board of Trade look at matters from quite a different standpoint. If a ship runs ashore, and there is a chance that an unfortunate captain or an officer may be implicated and punished, a formal investigation is speedily ordered and proceeded with. But evidently missing ships receive by no means the same zealous attention at the hands of the Board of Trade. In their case all that seems to be necessary is a preliminary inquiry conducted in private by somebody nominated for the purpose by the Board of Trade. Usually it is the Collector of Customs, who can hardly be deemed a competent judge of nautical affairs. We are denied an investigation in open Court, where all the witnesses obtainable who can give material evidence can be called, and can be subjected to that searching cross-examination which is likely to lead to elucidating doubtful circumstances and eliciting material facts, which would enable the Court to arrive at something approaching a definite conclusion as to the probable couse of the disaster. It is only by cross-examination that the veracity of a witness and the worth of his evidence is to be properly tested, and preliminary inquiries, where *ex parte* statements only are to be obtained, are absolutely worthless.

The first case which I desire to bring to your Lordships' notice is that of the steamer "Neptune," which left port on 1st January last, and has never since been heard of. No public inquiry has been held into this disaster, even though I understand that the Imperial Merchant Service Guild have informed the Board of Trade that they feel that the matter is one which demands thorough inquiry, and, so far as I can gather, the Marine Engineer's Association representing the certificated engineers of this country, are of the same opinion. The Board of Trade, in reply to the Guild, state that, from the information before them concerning the "Neptune," they do not think that any useful purpose would be served by a formal inquiry, but that they would be prepared to reconsider their decision should any fresh facts of importance be brought to their notice. But it is the clear business of the Board of Trade itself to elicit as many facts as possible in connection with shipping casualties, and my contention is that they cannot do so without a public investigation and without cross-examination of the various witnesses who are able to give any evidence bearing on the case.

The information supplied to the Board of Trade as a result of the private preliminary inquiry is, I presume, carefully pigeon-holed, and the public are absolutely in the dark as to any details connected with the "Neptune" at the time she sailed on what proved to be her last voyage. Her captain did not, I believe, hold a Board of Trade certificate, though I do not mention this as having anything to do with the casualty. I have, however, seen letters from a near relation of one of the leading members of the crew of the "Neptune," who refers to different matters which seem to warrant thorough investigation, if only, as I have said before, for the purpose of quieting what may be unnecessary and unjust suspicion.

The next case referred to in my notice is the loss of the "Grindon Hall," a large steamer of the turret type, carrying over 5,000 tons of cargo, her crew consisting of twenty-six hands all told. She left the port of Sulina for Glasgow on 4th December last, and has not since been heard of. One would have thought that a public investigation into this disaster would be ordered as a matter of course. But this was not so. Whether the pressure which had been brought to bear upon the Board of Trade in connection with the absence of a public inquiry into the loss of the "Neptune" accounts for it, I cannot say, but it seems somewhat curious that in the case of the "Grindon Hall," which came on at a later date, the Board of Trade adopted a very unusual course. The general practice is for the preliminary inquiry to be held before the Collector of Customs, but in this case of the "Grindon Hall" the Board of Trade specially nominated the stipendiary magistrate at Cardiff, assisted by Captain W. B. Bigley as a nautical assessor, to conduct the preliminary inquiry.

The solicitor for the Board of Trade attended this preliminary inquiry, and so did the solicitor for the owners of the steamer. Various witnesses also attended for the purpose of giving evidence. But, at the outset of the proceedings, the stipendiary cleared the Court, stating that it was only a preliminary inquiry, and the shorthand writer was alone allowed to remain in his official capacity as shorthand writer to the Board of Trade. On the solicitor for the owners of the steamer inquiring whether he was to leave the Court too, the stipendiary remarked: "Certainly." The proceedings were then conducted in private.

Another circumstance that is also most unusual is that the Board of Trade have now issued a full Report of the conclusions of this preliminary inquiry for the information of the public, and I should like to know why they have done so in this case and not in the case of the "Neptune." Why should one disaster be dealt with differently from another, when information of public interest is published by the Board of Trade? Furthermore, it is a most unjust, and a highly improper course, that a private investigation should be held where responsible parties are not allowed the right of legal representation, when the results of this inquiry are to be issued by the Board of Trade, and when quite possibly they may contain opinions and allegations which might have been proved to have been without foundation had there been proper representation of the different interests at the inquiry itself.

To show your Lordships how unfairly the practice operates, I find in the Report of this inquiry that, on the testimony of certain witnesses, important statements as to the loading of the ship said to have been made by the unfortunate captain of the "Grindon Hall" are stated to have been apparently inaccurate. In fact, the captain to all intents and purposes is branded as a perjurer and held responsible for the loss of his own life and the lives of his crew in sailing from Sulina with his cargo not stowed in accordance with the declaration he made before the British Consul: "That it had been stowed in accordance with Section 454 of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894." I say that it is an outrage that secret investigations may be held into terrible disasters of this kind, where representation is denied the parties concerned, and where, as a result of the inquiry, the Board of Trade may issue a Report of its opinions which drag in the mire the good names of men who have lost their lives in an honourable calling.

I make no charges or insinuations whatever against anybody connected with the ship—whether builders, owners, stevedores, or crew; but I do earnestly contend that as this is a matter which concerns the public it is a public inquiry only which will satisfy us in like matters. I have seen letters from shipmasters who have taken great interest in this "Grindon Hall" case, knowing a good deal about it. I do not think it right to bring their views forward, as under the circumstances it would be improper to do so. But there is one very important fact with which all seamen are familiar, and that is the extreme difficulty of launching boats from turret-built vessels in times of emergency when heavy weather prevails. This is a point which was well worthy of the attention of the gentlemen who conducted the preliminary inquiry, but, so far as I can judge from their Report, it seems to have been entirely neglected by them. It is well-known amongst seamen that in heavy weather a life-boat when launched, is apt to get dashed on to what is sometimes called the "boat-deck" or turtle back, thereby, perhaps, causing irretrievable damage to the boat. It seemes that a life-boat of the "Grindon Hall" was picked up at sea, and from its condition as described in the Report it is not improbable that the damage was caused in the manner to which I have referred. I may call this speculation founded on what is an undoubted fact in launching boats in heavy weather from turret-built ships. However, this is a side issue upon which I need not dwell further.

What I wish to impress upon your Lordships is that catastrophes such as those of the "Neptune" and the "Grindon Hall" are allowed to be passed by without any public investigation, and that in the case of the "Grindon Hall" the procedure followed by the Board of Trade was of a very unfortunate character. Why there should be any need for secrecy in connection with these inquiries I cannot understand. Surely it is not the desire of the Board of Trade to conceal anything, or to rely upon preliminary inquiries, which, obviously, are thoroughly unsatisfactory from a public point of view. The merchant mariners of this country—and I have given your Lordships the names of two of their great representative associations—are wholly justified in their contention that the loss of a missing ship is of serious import to all seafarers, and a matter which demands public investigation. To avoid this is to court hostile criticism and suspicion, for which, possibly, there is no foundation whatever. The opinion expressed by an eminent authority, Judge Backhouse, President of the New South Wales Court of Marine

Inquiry, was that a full public inquiry should be held in all cases of marine disasters, however trivial.

I earnestly hope that your Lordships will favour me with your support in this matter, and agree to my Motion that in every case where it is at all practicable the loss of a missing ship should be matter for a formal investigation to be held in open Court, and conducted in accordance with the sections of the Merchant Shipping Act which fully provide for it. We cannot be too solicitous about our sailors or about their safety. They undertake risks and perils of quite an exceptional character, and they are performing a national service in bringing our food supplies to this country. When, as in the case of the "Grindon Hall," they lose their lives in this vitally important work, or in ships engaged in other branches of our commerce, it is for His Majesty's Government to avail themselves of their powers, and to endeavour to find out in some satisfactory and open way whether every human precaution had been taken to ensure the safety of the men whose lives had been lost in such a sad and tragic manner. I beg to submit the Motion standing in my name.

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in every case where a British ship is posted as missing and given up as lost, a public investigation should, when practicable, be ordered by the Board of Trade in order, if possible, to elicit any material facts which might tend to throw light on the probable cause of the disaster."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

* LORD **HAMILTON OF DALZELL**: My Lords, I can assure the noble Lord and the House that the Board of Trade are fully sensible of the great responsibility which rests upon them to investigate most thoroughly any such disasters as the two which form the subject of the noble Lord's question. I think I had, perhaps, better explain to the House the course which is adopted in these cases.

By the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894 the Board of Trade are empowered to hold an inquiry in the case of the loss of any British ship, and a preliminary investigation may be held by an inspecting officer of the Coastguard, a chief officer of Customs, or by any persons appointed for the purpose by the Board of Trade. The practice is that this preliminary inquiry is held, and if there is any suspicion that anything could be brought home to any one as being the cause of the loss of the vessel, or if the result of the inquiry is to show that there is a tittle of evidence to be put before a Court of law, a further public inquiry before a Court of summary jurisdiction invariably takes place.

In these two cases preliminary inquiries were held. In the case of the "Neptune," it was held by the chief Customs officers of Dundee and Liverpool, and the purport of their report was that there was no evidence of any sort to bring before a judicial inquiry. In the case of the "Grindon Hall," a similar inquiry was held by Mr. Lewis, the stipendiary magistrate at Cardiff, with Captain Bigley as an assessor; and the result of that inquiry, as the noble Lord has pointed out, is contained in the Report which has been published by the Board of Trade. This Report was published in accordance with the usual practice, and I think a perusal of the Report will show that there was no evidence of any sort to bring before a Court of Law. At one time it was the practice to hold a judcial inquiry in every case; but on many occasions it was found that there was no evidence of any sort to bring before the Court, and much money, time, and trouble were absolutely wasted. I can assure the House again that these preliminary inquiries are held most carefully, and that if there is a tittle of evidence to bring before a Court the further inquiry is invariably held. I hope, therefore, that the noble Lord will not press his Motion, and that this matter will be left, as it has been in the past, to be dealt with at the discretion of the President of the Board of Trade.

* LORD **ELLENBOROUGH**: My Lords, whenever the humblest landsman belonging to this country loses his life by an unfortunate sudden death he is entitled to a public coroner's inquest, and the matter is carefully gone into. Here is a case in which twenty-six seamen have disappeared, yet no public inquiry is to be held at all concerning the disaster. I will, with the permission of your Lordships,

read a short summary of the investigation concerning the "Grindon Hall" as it appeared in the July number of the *Nautical Magazine*, which reached me this afternoon. It is said that—

> "The Court, after taking evidence, are of opinion that the vessel must have foundered through having insufficient stability as laden. In all other respects she was proved to have been in good and seaworthy condition, but she was not loaded in accordance with the plan of loading approved by the Board of Trade on the 25th November, 1905, or in accordance with the provisions of Schedule 18 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, or in accordance with the regulations made by the Board of Trade under the provisions of Section 53 of the said Act."

The law has been broken, twenty-six lives have been lost, and yet there is to be no public inquiry! I do not at all know what the result of a public inquiry might be, but I do not believe that masters and officers of ships are in the habit either of over-loading their ships or of going to sea with their cargo improperly stowed unless pressure is put upon them by the owners, either to carry more cargo or to hurry their ship along to save time. For these reasons I think that the circumstances should be threshed out in some way in public. A private inquiry is no answer to loss of life, and I hope the Board of Trade will reconsider their intention not to hold any further inquiry.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, I confess that so far as the conversation has gone I do not think your Lordships can be quite satisfied with the answer which has been given to the question of my noble friend. I entirely share the view of the noble Lord who has just sat down that these secret inquiries are of very doubtful expediency. If the thing is fit for an inquiry at all it is far better that the inquiry should be public in its character, and the analogy which he has drawn between an accident resulting in loss of life at sea and one resulting in loss of life on land seems to me a perfectly fair and true analogy. If life is lost by an accident on land in this country there is, and must always be, a public inquiry; no exception whatever is permitted by the law. However lacking the evidence may turn out to be, there must be a coroner's inquest; and I do not see why in a serious loss of life at sea there should not be a similar public inquiry.

The special case of the "Grindon Hall" is that the inquiry which was held was a secret inquiry. If it had remained secret there might have been something to be said for it; but, although the inquiry was conducted in private, although the interested parties were not allowed to be represented, the solicitor for the owners having been excluded from the room, the Board of Trade afterwards published the result of the inquiry. I do not wish to pronounce a definite and final opinion, but, on the face of it, that appears to me a very unfair proceeding. The noble Lord who replied on behalf of the Board of Trade said that the result of the inquiry was to show that there was no evidence against anybody, but I think he is inaccurate in that respect, because I hold the report of the inquiry in my hand, and this is what is stated—

> "In the notice delivered by the master to the Consular officer at Sulina on the day he sailed, he stated that he had 200 tons of cargo in bags in the hold. In the same notice he also stated that the vessel had been loaded in accordance with the Board of Trade letter dated 25th November. According, however, to the affidavits of the stevedore, and the testimony of Captain Beck and another, the master's statements, both as to bagging and as to loading in accordance with the Board of Trade instructions, appear to have been inaccurate."

I am not quite sure whether the Court found that the statement was proved—I do not think they did—but, at any rate, a statement was made that the master, whose life was lost in the accident, was responsible for an action contrary to law and which presumably may be taken to have been partly the cause of what happened.

I do not think it is right or proper that, having held an inquiry from which the representatives of the parties were excluded, the Board of Trade should publish a Report gravely incriminating one of the parties. If, as Lord Hamilton says, in cases where a preliminary inquiry reveals something wrong a public inquiry always follows, then I want to know why a public inquiry did not follow in this case. I am almost certain that the noble Earl who leads the House will express his sympathy with the view put forward by Lord Muskerry, and, if he does

I hope my noble friend will not persist in his Motion. But if the noble Earl does not, then I think my noble friend's Motion will be justified.

THE EARL OF MEATH: My Lords, I do not profess to be competent to enter into the details concerning the loss of these two ships, but as a humble Member of your Lordship's House, and one of the general public, I think I am as qualified as any man in the street might be to express an opinion with regard to the Motion of the noble Lord, that it is desirable, in every case where a British ship is posted as missing and given up as lost, that a public investigation should, where practicable, be ordered by the Board of Trade, in order to elicit, if possible, any material facts which might tend to throw light on the probable cause of the disaster.

The seafaring population of this country is the backbone of our protection. We have to rely solely upon the sailors of the country, not only for naval protection, but for our very food. Therefore, their well-being is a matter of the most vital importance to this country. We have to consider how to make these men contented, feeling that they are protected by Parliament, and that they can go upon these ships without the knowledge that their lives might be sacrificed through the negligence, if not through the wickedness, of the owners of these vessels. That is the point, and what I wish to know is, are the Board of Trade taking that view of the question or not? If they realise that the sailors of this country must be protected, and that the British public will insist upon it if once they know that they are not protected, then I say they are doing right. But if they are for one moment allowing the owners, or money, or wealth, or influence to have anything to say to the lives of the sailors, they are on the wrong line, and they will know it soon enough; for if there comes forward a man with the power of speech, able to address large audiences and to tell them that the Board of Trade are considering the interests of rich men and not the interests of poor men, then those at present in office will not sit long on the benches of power.

I do not say one thing or the other; but I do say this with emphasis, that to the ordinary man in the street the answer that has been given by the noble Lord who represents the Government shows quite clearly that the Board of Trade are thinking much more about the expense of investigations than of the lives of the men. If that idea once gets possession of the public, woe betide any Government that permits it. A very true analogy was given by Lord Ellenborough—that of an accidental death on land. That is only the case of one individual, but is it not much more important that we should insist upon an open inquiry in the case of the loss of vessels with many hands? It appears to me that the Board of Trade have not taken the question of the well-being of our seafaring population sufficiently seriously.

Before sitting down I should like to thank the noble Lord, Lord Muskerry, who has, by his able and persistent conduct in this House on behalf of the sailors of the mercantile marine, given rise to the feeling throughout the country that it is your Lordships' House which has especially the interests of the sailor at heart. I thank him for it. I am proud that this House should take the sailor under its care, and I hope that the noble Lord's Motion will be passed. Money, my Lords, ought not to come into consideration at all. It is a question of the lives of our seamen; it is a question of the food of this country; it is a question of our very existence from day to day; and I, therefore, hope your Lordships will support the Motion of my noble friend.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I am afraid that I am not acquainted with the special circumstances of the two cases which have been brought before the House by the noble Lord. I shall have a word to say in a moment about the noble Earl who has just sat down; but, in the meantime, I am in agreement with him as to the service which the noble Lord opposite does, and has for so long done, in bringing cases affecting the comfort and lives of the sailors of the mercantile marine before your Lordships' House, backed by a knowledge in which in this respect he has no equal in this Assembly.

The noble Earl who has just sat down had rather detracted attention from the facts of the case by an outburst of rhetoric. I have no objection to the noble Earl assuming an exceedingly high standard, both of conduct and morality. We all greatly respect the noble Earl. But I do not think that that entitles him to bring against those who represent a public department vague, reckless, and, as I believe, absolutely unfounded charges of indifference to the lives of our seamen. I protest very strongly against such language as that. It does not help the noble Earl's case. The case is one, I admit, well worthy of consideration. It was set before us in a very moderate manner by Lord Muskerry, by the noble Lord who followed him, and by the noble Marquess on the front bench opposite, who, having been himself at the Board of Trade, speaks on this subject with authority. I shall, therefore, say no more with regard to the noble Earl on the cross benches.

I quite admit that the views which have been expressed by the noble Lords opposite are worthy of close examination. It may be, I think, that either one of two courses ought to be taken. If a private inquiry is held in such cases as this it should, as the noble Marquess has said, remain private. I think there is much to be said for that view, and I have no doubt my noble friend behind me will represent it to the Board of Trade. On the other hand, I can conceive that there would be very great difficulty, in cases where an accident had occurred from which unhappily nobody had survived, in carrying out a public judicial inquiry. For such an inquiry you must have real evidence, and I take it that the analogy upon which it is possible to go is that in the case, for instance, of a railway accident. An inquest may be held, and is held, of course, upon the victims of the accident; but at the same time it may be desirable in some cases to hold an inquiry into the causes of the accident, not always of a public character, at which language can be used which could not be used by those who have to give evidence on oath.

I take it that if a public inquiry had been held in this case nobody would have been there to give what would be considered evidence in a Court of law, and I am given to understand that in past times these inquiries have been instituted and have been found to be absolutely nugatory from that fact. The inquiry has been open, but nothing in the nature of real evidence has been forthcoming, and it has had to be closed with an expression of regret. On the other point, as to private inquiries at which statements are made which are necessarily of a purely conjectural character, but, at the same time, may cause pain to the relatives of those who lost their lives in the unhappy accident—it is matter for close consideration whether those charges, if charges they be, should in any sense be made public, and my noble friend behind me will no doubt see that my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade is informed of the strong opinions on this point which have been expressed by noble Lords opposite.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I only intervene as a result of what the noble Lord has just said. I confess I am a little disturbed at finding that the report of such an inquiry as this, which ended in the conviction in the minds of those conducting the inquiry that some great irregularity, if not illegality, had been committed, and which *prima facie* will reflect upon the owners or charterers of the vessel as the case may be, is published, notwithstanding the fact that the solicitor representing the owner of the vessel had been excluded from the inquiry. I rather think the noble Earl himself feels that, too; and therefore I do not wish to enforce it further. I presume they had some evidence. At all events, if there is enough evidence to justify the examining officers coming to a particular conclusion, it ought to be made known what was the nature of the evidence adduced, because it may involve a very grave reflection upon the owners, the charterers, or the merchants, whoever it may be, at whose instance the vessel was sent to sea.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I shall, of course, be guided by my noble friend on the Front Opposition Bench as to whether or not I shall divide on my Motion. But I should like to call attention to the fact that nothing whatever has been said as to the case of the "Neptune." We do not know how many lives were lost in that vessel. There was a preliminary inquiry, but that is all we have heard. It often happens that coroners' inquests have no evidence placed before them, but they are always held. Why should there not be a public inquiry also in every case where a vessel is lost? [The noble Lord here consulted Lord SALISBURY.] In the circumstances, my Lords, I will not press my Motion to a division.

Motion, by leave, withrdawn.

HORSES FOR THE ARMY.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE rose to call attention to the recent Report of the Royal Commission on Horse-breeding and to the question of the provision of horses for military purposes, and to move for Papers. The noble Earl said: My Lords, it is not necessary for me to detain your Lordships at any length this afternoon in introducing the subject of which I have given notice. It is really a corollary of a debate which took place in your Lordships' House two years ago, when several noble Lords had the opportunity of placing their views at some length before the House. The debate on that occasion, I think it is not exaggerating to say, displayed a serious state of affairs, and a state of affairs of which there has been no active amelioration since that date, though I am the first to admit that something has been done in the field of inquiry.

Shortly after the debate to which I refer, the noble Earl opposite, the President of the Board of Agriculture, was good enough to summon a number of those of us who are interested in this subject to a conference at the Board of Agriculture—a conference which, I think, was of very great educational value. A number of other conferences have also taken place. There was one at the United Service Institution, there have been some, I think, at the military headquarters, and there was one about ten days ago following upon a banquet of a club interested in military matters and to which many of your Lordships belong. The views, therefore, of very many people have been placed before the Government, and I do not intend to repeat those views at any great length. My purpose this afternoon is to ask His Majesty's Government whether, with the expert knowledge now at their command, they intend to take any definite action in the immediate future. One cannot help feeling that during the last two years the position of affairs has become much more serious. Two breeding seasons have been lost, but I sincerely hope that we are not going to lose a third.

At one of the conferences to which I have referred a distinguished officer from the War Office was good enough to attend and to tell us the latest mobilisation requirements of the Army in the matter of horses. This officer told us that in order to mobilise all our troops we required 173,000 horses. Of this number 59,000 are required for the cavalry, and 17,000 for the Reserve. The wastage of war will probably cause a rehorsing in six months, and at the end of the year, therefore, there will have been taken 180,000 horses for the cavalry alone. The resouces of the United Kingdom are roughly 1,500,000 horses; but only 150,000 of these are fit for cavalry use. Therefore in this country at present we have 30,000 fewer horses than we should require in the first year of a war. That is serious enough, but the position is getting worse, for the birth-rate is decreasing.

In England, according to the latest figures which I have been able to obtain, there were 10,000 fewer foals in 1906 than in 1905. In Ireland there were 1,450 fewer brood mares and 1,250 fewer recreation horses, as a result of a comparison of those two years; and I was surprised and horrified to hear a distinguished ex-Governor of an Australian Colony state at one of the conferences to which I have referred, that the same tale of decrease is to be told in respect of Australia and Canada; so that we are becoming more and more dependent on the foreigner and less and less on ourselves. But at the same time our export of horses shows an increase. In 1904, we exported only 32,955 horses, but in 1906 we exported 60,400; and your Lordships will, of course, realise that foreign buyers do not come to

England to buy our worst horses or our average horses, but our best. Whereas in 1904 we had in this country 208,000 horses under a year old, in 1907 there were but 184,000, and in Ireland there has been a decrease of 11,500 horses in three years.

Your Lordships will remember the difficulties which this country experienced in obtaining horses for the South African war. If I remember rightly, we required for that war, roughly, half a million horses, and we had the markets of the world open to us. We cannot lay down as a fact that in any future war in which we may be engaged we shall find similar facilities for the supply of the horses we require; but, even apart from that, it is not exaggerating to say that if a war were upon us now our difficulty in getting horses would be infinitely greater than it was ten years ago. In almost every direction you find an increase of difficulty. Every one of your Lordships who read the Report of Lord Elgin's Commission will remember that far and away the most satisfactory thing in connection with the horsing of the Army in South Africa was the successful result of the employment of the London 'bus horse as an Artillery horse. Everybody spoke well of them; but at one of the recent conferences a director of one of the London omnibus companies said that at this moment 80 per cent. of the London omnibus horses were foreign born. I only mention this in passing to show that it is not a satisfactory feature, and that even the horses which proved the most satisfactory that we had to deal with in South Africa cannot be produced in England to a greater extent than 20 per cent. Obviously, therefore, something must be done.

Activity is called for on the part of the Government, and by activity one means extension of organisation, and extension of organisation, of course, means money. We do not want quack remedies. I was surprised to see, in an account of a speech made the other day by a distinguished soldier who is interested in this matter, a proposal, put forward, I hope, not seriously, that the motor car *de luxe* should be discouraged by heavy taxation, the money to go, not to the improvement of the roads, as has been suggested by my noble friend behind me, Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, but to go to horse-breeding. I do not think that my noble friend who represents the War Office would himself adopt that as a practical remedy, but it is interesting as showing what extraordinary schemes are put forward. We do not, as I say, want quack remedies. It is only Government action that can help us to deal properly with the competition we are suffering from at this moment on the part of foreign Governments. The question resolves itself under two very simple heads—firstly, what is to be done; and, secondly, who is to do it?

In answer to the question what is to be done, there are, to my mind, two essentials that must be considered. In the first place, there must be a large extension of what is now done for stallions. At present the Royal Commission are able to offer twenty-eight King's premiums for stallions, and these I believe to be wholly insufficient to ensure breeding solely from good stallions, or to ensure that all our best stallions are not taken out of the country by foreign Governments. This action must be extended and increased. I do not wish to suggest that we should extend it to the extent that foreign Governments have gone. I believe the French Government owns 2,500 stallions. I do not suggest that we should try to emulate that example, but I mention the figure as showing that whatever we do now is totally inadequate when compared with these figures. I believe the Irish plan is a good one. In Ireland facilities are given by the Government to enable private individuals to purchase good stallions, but that does not go far enough. Personally I should not hesitate to support a Government which proposed to make it absolutely illegal to charge a serving fee for any stallion unless it was already passed and certified as sound by a Government inspector.

I hope the Government will do something also as regards mares. Many of our best mares are now leaving the country, having been purchased by foreign Governments and individuals abroad. They are thus lost to us or breeding purposes. It is a regrettable fact that a mare bought for the Army is equally lost. I believe it is a most exceptional thing that a mare once bought for the Army is ever used for the purpose of breeding. The Army system is that once they have got a horse they work it until it drops, and by the time it drops it is not a very good subject for breeding purposes. I do not intend to go into detail on the subject of what is required for mares. The details are before your Lordships in the Report of the Royal Commission now lying on the Table. Suffice it to say that something must be done to re-stock districts with suitable mares, and at the same time to ensure that their progeny is not entirely lost for the purposes of further breeding. We require, in fact, to build up our stock in the districts from top to bottom for breeding purposes.

Something has been done without cost to the public, but not enough to cause amelioration to the extent required. But I think enough has been done to show that from small beginnings and small expenditure satisfactory results do follow, and results such as would justify the most timid of Governments—I am not now referring to the present Government —to take a plunge. I am informed that in one district eleven mares were placed out under observation at a cost of £15. I do not pretend that the noble Earl opposite will be able to organise any districts at a cost of 25s. per mare, but I mention the figure as showing that with very little initial expenditure something can be done, and that a moderate expenditure may really be expected to have a great result.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Lord LUCAS): They were not bought for £15.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: No, they were presents, but the distributing organisation only cost £15. I now come to the second question: Who is to do this? The Royal Commission has hitherto been the only authority interesting itself in this question in a practical manner and although there have been certain attacks lately made on the Royal Commisssion, I certainly do not desire to associate myself with them, and, above all, I do not wish to rush in between the two assailants. I think everybody will admit that the Royal Commission has for twenty-one years done excellent work with almost starvation resources, and the public owes them a most sincere debt of gratitude for the good work that has been gratuitously done by the individual members. The Reports they make from time to time, the twelfth of which is now before your Lordships, contain almost invariably information and advice to anyone interested in horse-breeding. They have always known their own minds, they have advocated certain measures of amelioration ever since they were formed, and it has only been want of funds that has prevented them carrying out their original policy. A policy of premiums is not, I believe, what they would consider their first and their principal remedy. They were forced back upon their second line of policy for want of funds, but I think everybody will admit that their second line of policy has been a very successful one. I am informed that the success of the premium system as regards the main object with which it was instituted—that is to say, the promotion of soundness—is shown by the fact that with an annual production of 783 foals from premium horses their descendants won 498 prizes in 1907.

The Earl of Donoughmore.

But if the work of the Royal Commission is to be extended, or, to put it boldly, if the Treasury is to provide more money for this kind of work, I cannot disguise from myself the fact that they are more likely to provide it if it is to be spent under the supervision of a Government Department. Therefore, if the necessities of the case make some sort of reorganisation necessary —I believe they do—I would content myself by saying that I hope the benefit which the public has received from the advice of this body of experts for the past twenty-one years will not be lost, and that we shall continue to enjoy the advantage of the assistance in some form or other of the individual members of the Royal Commission. What is it, therefore, that the Government have to hand? They have the fruits of twenty-one years of experience; they have the reports of conferences innumerable, in the course of which everybody interested in the subject has been able to put his view forward; and they have in the Papers before your Lordships certain schemes which I claim have acted successfully, though only on small lines. I hope, therefore, that before this debate concludes, the noble Earl opposite will be able to tell us that he means to push forward vigorously, both as regards organisation and expenditure, towards an object, upon the advisability of reaching which I take it we are all agreed.

Moved, "For Papers relating to the question of the provision of horses for military purposes."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

LORD RIBBLESDALE: My Lords, I must first thank the noble Earl for the flattering tribute he paid to the modest, if painstaking, operations of the Royal Commission. The noble Earl said, at the conclusion of his remarks, that if a grant was likely to be given to supplement more substantially what has been done by the Royal Commission, it would be more willingly given by Parliament if vested in a Government Department rather than in the present Royal Commission. Although as a Commissioner I might have liked to have had notice of that proposition, speaking off-hand I find myself in agreement with him. The noble Earl also said that this is a subject which invariably lends itself to repetition. I have noticed that anything to do with horses always does. I will, however, try not to repeat what I have previously said and what the noble Earl has said, and there is no necessity, I think, for me to give again the figures with which he has already dealt in the best possible way to bring the present state of things home to the House. I was very glad that the noble Earl who moved this Motion did not adduce an argument which I have constantly heard brought forward,namely, why does the richest country in the world only give £5,000 a year to horse-breeding, while France gives £200,000, and Austria £220,000? I was glad that argument was not used, because the cases are not comparable, we having no extended land frontiers to protect.

I do not like bounty-fed industries. I dislike extremely any restriction on the free current of supply and demand, and I think the sombre picture of our horse possibilities is often overdrawn and the jeremiads about it are very often overdone. Yet at the same time I find myself in agreement with the noble Earl in that, with all these reservations in my mind, we are at present face to face with a combination of various circumstances which, if it becomes normal, will be certainly insecure, and in the emergency of a sudden outbreak of war would at once become extremely hazardous. I rest myself for this on the words of Lord Carrington a few months ago when he told a company of his countrymen that horse-breeding occupies a thoroughly unsafe and unsatisfactory position. No one will accuse the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture of being a pessimist about any of the duties that are committed to his charge. When he says that, I think we may believe that he is citing what is the actual state of things, and we may credit him with a sincere determination to get this position into a more agreeable prospective in view of occurrences which might arise.

As the noble Earl who has just spoken said, we are considering especially the provision of public service horses—artillery, cavalry, and transport. The noble Earl said a good many things about 'bus horses which I will not go into, but I say "ditto" to him on those points. While we may look upon it from the Army point of view, we have also got the consumer and the taxpayer's point of view inextricably involved. We are all taxpayers, many of us are interested directly or indirectly in agriculture, we are all concerned with an efficient cavalry, and as a House we have always been particularly connected by the public with a knowedge of and liking for any thing to do with horseflesh. I remember the late Lord Pembroke used to say that there was only one subject which did interest the House of Lords, namely, anything to do with horses. So that such seed as is sown to-night seems to me to have the benefit of being sown on more or less prepared ground.

In my opinion what we have to consider is whether the taxpayer can be honestly recommended to give a little more, either directly or indirectly, for public service horses, and whether agriculture by some practical covenant of this kind can be induced to breed more horses of the type and quality required, from which Army purchasers can select their requirements and anticipate the foreign purchaser, whose operations are represented by some people as being almost piratical, though as a producer of horses I cannot take quite that view myself. I am told that only the other day the powers that be at the War Office, acting in harmony with the powers that be at the Board of Agriculture, came to the conclusion that a good thing would be for the Government to buy three-year-olds. That I believe to be a matter of cardinal importance, and it would be the most important step taken since this question has been prominently before the public. It would give an especial stimulus in England. I believe that the great majority—certainly over 70 per cent.—of the horses for the Army are bought in Ireland. They are purchased when four years old. The Irishman has an aptitude for horses which the Englishman does not possess. He has a country which is practically unfenced, and he naturally wishes to keep his horse till it is four years old. If he does not like the animal then, he is willing to sell it at remount price, but he is not willing to sell a three-year-old. But there are lots of people in England with small fenced holdings, and the very last thing they want is a wild and well-bred three-year-old knocking about the place with no one to look after him. That man is willing to sell a three-year-old, and I, as a taxpayer, would run the risk of buying a three-year-old. The foreigners are quite good enough judges to come here and buy our three-year-olds.

I rather agree with the noble Earl that if something is going to be done, it need not be a very large sum. The Government have already a good deal of experience, and active machinery is at hand which has been more or less perfected by the Brood Mare Society, the Hunters' Improvement Society, the farmers' clubs, and the district committees which do a great deal of useful work for the Royal Commission. The noble Earl referred to quack remedies. Speaking as a taxpayer I am not fond of very heroic remedies, represented by the figures which I see constantly advocated in the Press and by enthusiasts on this subject. Having had twenty-one years experience in this matter, and having agitated on the question in a more or less quiet way—without robbing myself of a night's rest or getting locked up for storming the House of Commons—I say that the present Minister for War is the only Minister in my experience who has given any real direct attention to the solution of this difficulty. He is, I believe, acting in the most harmonious relation with the President of the Board of Agriculture. No doubt both Ministers are in the usual difficulty in which I believe Ministers invariably find themselves when they want to do anything which costs money, the difficulty lying in the taxpayers' pocket and the ever-increasing accounts of our national housekeeping books. I am certain that the man we have got to convince is not my noble friend below me or my right hon. friend the Minister for War—the man we have got to convince is the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who very properly keeps a jealous care of his key and is responsible to the taxpayer for the money he finds. What I think all who are interested in this particular question have to do is to make out a sufficiently good case on its merits and of not too heroic dimensions, which will convince the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give a grant such as that recommended by Lord Donoughmore, not of a very large amount, but of a considerably larger amount than that which is at present at the disposal of the Royal Commission.

*THE EARL OF ERROLL: My Lords, I should like to say a word in support of the noble Earl who has brought this subject before the House, because I think it is quite impossible to exaggerate the importance of it both from a national and from an Army point of view. I think the fact that we have admittedly lost the predominant position we used to occupy as a horse-breeding country and the fact that the Royal Commission has told us that the country has been swept of stallions, mares, and three-year-olds render it imperative that the Government should do something to try and arrest a further denuding of the country of horses suitable for military purposes.

To my mind it is impossible to disguise the fact that it is altogether beyond the power of private enterprise to cope with this question. It can only be dealt with by State aid and under scientific direction, and, in spite of what Lord Ribblesdale has said, on a scale which has never before been contemplated in this country. The public have never realised how great the danger from a military point of view is. Otherwise they never would have acquiesced in the miserable sum of £5,000, which is all that has been allowed to the Royal Commission for the encouragement of horse-breeding. In foreign countries all this is very differently managed, and every encouragement is given to the breeder to produce good cavalry horses. The amount spent in France is, I believe, £300,000 a year, and not £200,000 as has been stated; in Germany, £190,000; in Austria-Hungary £370,000; in Russia, £500,000 per annum; and Italy, £54,000. It is small wonder that our cavalry should not be so well mounted as foreign cavalry, and that our horses should be of a decidedly inferior character to the horses of France, Germany, and Austria. I have this on the very best authority, and I do not think it is a matter of which this country can be proud. As far as the question of land frontiers goes I can hardly agree with Lord Ribblesdale, because we have almost the largest land frontiers in the world in India and in Canada.

In discussing this question it is quite impossible to separate the two problems, the civil and the military. Unless we can get the farmer to produce the horse, the Army, of course, cannot get it, and, conversely, if the breeder cannot get a market other than the normal market of the Army it will not pay him to breed. The normal number of horses we want annually is 2,700, but on mobilisation that number would rush up to 170,000. It is between these two figures that the great difficulty exists, and I hope the noble Earl the Minister for Agriculture will be able to give us some idea of how this is to be remedied. The other day Lord Newton asked the Under-Secretary of State for War how soon the Territorial Army would be able to mobilise, and Lord Lucas replied, "Instantly." I ventured at the time to ask whether arrangements had been made for the horses for the Territorial Army on mobilisation, in addition to those which would be required for the Regular Army. The noble Lord replied that the horses were in the country, and that the question was receiving due consideration. I have very grave doubts as to whether horses for the Territorial Force on mobilisation exist in the country.

It has been admitted that if we were to mobilise the Regulars at once we should be 54,000 horses short. I understand that the Artillery alone require 18,000 horses; only about 5,000 are available for the purpose, and since what I may call the passing of the 'bus horse the balance is very much more difficult to get. The figures which the War Office have supplied are largely conjectural, and I think it is of the greatest importance that there should be a census of the horses in this country, and that they should be properly classified. There is no doubt that what are called general utility horses are getting fewer year by year, because it does not pay farmers to breed them. What they breed are cart horses and show horses, but these are of no use for military purposes. The public do not realise that of the 21,000 Yeomanry less than one-half have their own horses, some 11,000 being hired, and, what is more, these are hired over and over again, with the result that it would be impossible for all the Yeomanry regiments to go into training at the same time. In the case of some of the London regiments they are entirely horsed, I believe, by Mr. Tilling, who stipulates that they should not train simultaneously, as three men cannot ride one horse. I think that is a serious matter. Every Yeoman in the country ought to have a horse registered which could be immediately claimed on mobilisation.

Reference has been made to a discussion which took place the other night at a meeting of the National Defence Association, at which Lord Ribblesdale read a paper. There were present at that meeting, besides the Minister for Agriculture, a great many officers, some now serving in the Remount Department and some who served in the Remount

Department at an earlier date, most of them with war service. Officers of the Artillery, Cavalry, and Yeomanry were also present. Mr. Tilling, who is, I believe, one of the largest jobmasters in London, was there, and an agent, who told us that during the last forty years he had supplied 37,000 horses to the French Government. Mr. Egan told us that in some years he had supplied them with as many as 2,500 horses. Last year he had only sent 300 horses over; he might have had a contract for 800 but could not find them. Mr. Tilling also stated that during the last fifteen years the price of a 'bus horse had gone up from £10 to £15, and that he had the greatest difficulty in finding them. The general opinion of those present at this very representative meeting seemed to be that the general utility horse was getting more and more difficult to find. They also thought that the numbers would not be forthcoming in an emergency. They suggested the importance of the retention of mares in this country, because they said that as long as we had racing here there would be no difficulty in getting the stallions. They also represented that it would be better if we could buy our horses at three years old instead of four years old, so as to prevent them being taken abroad.

I know I shall be told that instead of spending a great deal of money now the best thing for us to do will be to buy horses in the event of emergency, but I very much doubt whether we shall be able to do this, as in the case of a European war foreign Governments and staffs would see to it that the Continental markets were closed. Luckily the Boers overlooked this question; otherwise it can hardly be doubted that they would have done something to close the markets in Europe, while, with the large amount of treasure they then possessed, they might very easily have bought up all the horses in the Argentine. They meant to beat us all the time by their horses, but, unfortunately for them and luckily for us, they underrated our power of buying. It is very unpleasant to think of what would have happened to us supposing our supply of horses at that moment had failed. The waste of horses at the beginning of the South African War was very great. Going up to the relief of Kimberley the Cavalry Division was practically wrecked. I find no fault with that, because I think the game was quite worth the candle. In my opinion the relief of Kimberley and the surrender at Paardeberg perfectly justified the sacrifice of horses, but it is very painful to think what would have happened to us if that Cavalry Division could not have been remounted owing to the closing of the European markets, and if we could not have got horses for the very large number of mounted men required towards the end of the War.

We shall, of course, be able to get a certain number of horses from our colonies, but the number will be limited, and it must be remembered that every transport will have to be protected. I have pointed out these matters because I think they are worthy of consideration by the man in the street, who does not really appreciate the gravity of the situation. Lord Carrington told us, at the end of our discussion the other night, that the present state of the horse question in this country was a national disgrace. I hope the noble Earl will tell us to-night how he is going to remedy that disgrace. In conclusion, I would say that I do not see any use in encouraging breeding for the benefit of the foreigner; what we want is some scheme by which the horses we have can be retained in this country.

LORD LOVAT: I should like to ask the noble Earl one question. Does any one know, within half a million, the number of horses in Great Britain and Ireland at the present moment?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): All the horses in the United Kingdom? Two million and eighty-seven thousand.

LORD LOVAT: If the noble Earl will turn to Page 86 of the Agricultural Statistics, 1907, he will see that this total refers to horses for agricultural purposes, including mares kept for breeding and unbroken horses. That is the very point I want to bring out, because, so far as I can learn, nobody has the least idea—apparently not even the President of the Board of Agriculture —as to how many horses are in the streets of London, and the other great cities and elsewhere in the country. I believe that only one gentleman has attempted to solve this, and he was a Cambridge professor, whose book is, I believe, in the possession of the Board of Agriculture, and he gives a very different return. The first move before we can begin to discuss the question is to have a census of all the horses in the country. That will have to be done by law, and the horses should be classified as to their suitability for military purposes, and the annual veterinary certificates as to their fitness should be returned. The horse question is studied in every country but our own. In France and Germany every officer has a sealed envelope containing directions as to where his horses are, and where he is to send them in case of mobilisation. We have no sort of mobilisation orders in this matter. The War Office the other day issued an an Order that no horses should be recruited for the Territorial Army until the whole of the horses required for the Regular Army had been procured. That throws back the mobilisation of the Territorial Army to an unknown date. It is absolutely the fact that only on one occasion has there been a real census, and that was when the late General Gatacre, who was a very hard-working officer, had every horse in Wiltshire properly marked down. Before we can possibly get much further in the discussion of this subject we ought certainly to inform ourselves of the number of horses we have in this country, and the only method of doing that is to have a census enforced by law in order to get it thoroughly done.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, I do not propose to intervene for more than a brief moment between your Lordships and the reply of the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture. By his public utterances the noble Earl has given rise to very high hopes in this matter. He has told us very plainly indeed that he is impressed with the arguments which have been uttered not for the first time to-night by my noble friend behind me who was Under-Secretary for War in the last Government. He has told us that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has a great duty to perform. He did not tell us quite what that duty was, but I think we can fairly guess—it is to keep his pocket buttoned-up as closely as he can. But the noble Earl went on to say that he had great hopes that he would be able to persuade the Chancellor of the Exchequer to do something to overcome the difficulties referred to to-night. I wish to associate myself entirely with all that fell from my noble friend with regard to the work of the Royal Commission. The work of that Commission has occasionally been subjected to criticism, but I am quite certain that in all its Reports, and perhaps in this twelfth Report more than any, we have the most valuable contributions to the question of horse-breeding that any country could possibly desire to have. It is equally true that, if my noble friend succeeds in softening the heart of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it would be very difficult to do so to the extent of inviting him to increase the funds at the disposal of the Royal Commission. But I hope that there will not be any feeling between the members of that Commission and the President or the staff at the Board of Agriculture. I cannot myself, from some knowledge of the inner working of that office, see any reason why the Royal Commission might not very well work as the handmaid of the Board of Agriculture. I know there are extremely capable officials in that Department, but I am not prepared to say that they are equipped with special knowledge of the question of horse-breeding, and I think that special knowledge might easily be provided by the members of the Royal Commission. I sincerely hope that the noble Earl will be able to tell your Lordships to-night that it is the determination of the Government to deal seriously with this question. Every year it becomes more apparent that the horses available in this country in case of war are becoming fewer and fewer, and I can assure the noble Earl opposite that if he wants any support in the operation of unbuttoning the pocket of the Chancellor of the Exchequer he will get that support from those who sit on this side of the House.

*EARL CARRINGTON: My Lords, the Report of the Royal Commission, which has been introduced to your Lordships' notice in an excellent speech by the noble Earl opposite, is a double-barrelled Report. It deals first with the question of horse-breeding and the supply of military horses, which is very interesting and important; and, in the second place, it deals with a speech of my own made about sixteen months ago, which I am afraid is neither one nor the other. I can assure the House that, so far as the Board of Agriculture is concerned, the best possible feeling exists towards the Royal Commission. I am afraid I got rather into a scrape by making the speech which is noticed at length in the Report. Perhaps I may read my exact words. I said—

> "Almost the whole time of this conference was taken up by speeches of the members of the Commission, who enlarged on the need of more money but proposed no plan for dealing with the question."

I made a mistake. The best of us do that sometimes, and I apologise to the members of the Royal Commission for having used the plural for the singular. One member of the Commission made a somewhat lengthy speech which took up one-fifth of the time of the conference. The other members made excellent and pithy speeches, all to the point and many of them embodying excellent suggestions; but each of them said he was speaking for himself individually, and not for the Commission at all. I was right, therefore, when I said that no scheme was put forward by the Commission as a whole.

But the Commission's main Report contains a scheme which is practically complete, in which the policy of the Brood Mare Society is said to be probably the best means of dealing with the question. That is a great compliment to Mr. Algernon Turnor and the noble Earl opposite who have taken a great interest in that society. The other proposal is that the Government should purchase the very pick of the most desirable stallions in addition to the premium stallions. On the face of it, that seems to me rather a tall order when the income-tax stands at 1s. in the £. The Commissioners is their Report (page iv.) refer to the formation of a haras and state that the formation of a haras ought to be accompanied, they think, by a scheme for providing liberal premiums for competition by stallions; and in Paragraph II. they say—

> "From these views the Commissioners have never departed."

On the other hand, the idea of a haras has been condemned by Lord Donoughmore, by the Director-General of Remounts, by Sir Walter Gilbey, by Mr. Algernon Turnor, and others, and when such experts disagree it is not for me to decide the point. I do not, therefore, propose to take up your Lordships' time further in regard to that matter.

The last proposal of the Royal Commission is that, to encourage breeders, a large and liberal addition should be made to the prizes offered at agricultural shows; and for these three recommendations it is proposed that a grant of £25,000 should be given to the Royal Commission, in addition to the £5,000 already granted, making a total of £30,000 a year. Of course, it is not for me to say whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer of either Party would be willing to meet that demand. I think all will agree that the Report of the Royal Commission as it stands is extremely valuable and full of useful information. It contains many valuable suggestions from both individuals and societies, and, although the Report may not have given satisfaction to everybody—that, I think, is an impossibility—I heartily agree with the noble Lords who have preceded me that the country ought to be very grateful to the members who have attended the meetings of the Commission so regularly, and who have given so much of their time and done so much on so small a subsidy; and I think the thanks of the country are especially due to my noble friend behind me, Lord Ribblesdale, and to the Duke of Portland, who, I believe, were the original parents and promoters of the movement.

Before I leave the Report altogether there is one clause—Clause 45—to which I take exception. It is a damnatory clause, and, in condemning the present Government it says that seventeen months have elapsed and the country is still left without the aid and encouragement of the horsebreeding industry which is so greatly needed and is of so vital importance. That is perfectly true, but what struck me immediately on reading that clause was that if we are so much to blame for having done nothing in the matter for seventeen months, are not other people still more blameworthy for having done nothing for seventeen years? Still I know the *tu quoque* argument carries no weight in the country, and I will not pursue it; but I think the charge is a little unfair. When the present Government came into office two and-a-half years ago a great many agricultural matters required attention. We have been able to pass eight agricultural measures. It was not until the session of 1907 that we were able to take up this particular matter in earnest. As soon as I was able to deal with it I approached the War Office, which was very sympathetic and helpful, and we tried to frame a practical scheme which would meet the difficulties.

I will state, as clearly and briefly as I can, the proposals which eventually we mean to bring forward. We are face to face with two things. We have to encourage horse-breeding generally and to secure a reserve supply of horses of a class from which remounts for the Army can be obtained. We have heard this afternoon that the Army buys 2,500 horses annually at five years old; they pay £40 apiece, making a total of £100,000 a year; so that the War Office are a very fair customer of the tenant farmers of England and Ireland. Then we are told that 70,000 horses would be required on mobilisation of the expeditionary force, and the total number required to bring the units up to war estalishment is 174,000, of which 59,000 would be cavalry horses, a certain number would be artillery horses, and the others would be heavy draught horses necessary for the Army Service Corps and the wagons. This total of 174,000 includes the horses for the Territorial Force, but I do not propose to touch on that question now. The object is to get a scheme for the expeditionary force first, and then, afterwards, in concert with the lords-lieutenant and the County Associations, we will endeavour to find a scheme for the Territorial Force. The chief reason for having separate schemes is to avoid overlapping. Your Lordships will learn with satisfaction, on the authority of the Director-General of Remounts, that the present supply of horses in the country would probably nearly meet the requirements of that Department. The known number of horses in the country is 2,089,000. Those are agricultural and young horses, but that number does not include the horses in the towns.

Lord LOVAT: How many horses are there in the towns?

*Earl CARRINGTON: I was coming to that. The noble Lord's proposal that a census of the town horses should be taken is a very good one. That is a proposal we have under consideration. We wish to know what horses there are in private and public stables, in the omnibus and cab stables in the big towns in England. It is no use being an alarmist, and I think my noble friend Lord Lucas will bear me out that there is no immediate cause for alarm. If the horses are wanted at once they are there. We have that on the authority of the Director-General of Remounts; and, of course, we should be able to take these horses in case of invasion.

Earl FORTESCUE: Does the noble Earl know approximately how many horses there are other than agricultural horses in the country?

*Earl CARRINGTON: That is what I was endeavouring to explain. There is no census at the present moment——

Lord LOVAT: In fact, you have not the least idea how many there are?

*Earl CARRINGTON: Of course, there have been guesses, but I would prefer to stick to the statistics we have, if noble Lords would not mind.

Lord RIBBLESDALE: The noble Earl spoke of getting at the number of active horses in the towns. Is he under the impression that there is a census of the active horses in the country, including those which are the property of private owners? I do not remember any one asking me how many I had in my stables.

*EARL CARRINGTON: We have a Return of the number of horses in each part of the United Kingdom up to 1907. The total is 2,089,000. In addition, there are all the town horses of which it is suggested we should also have a census. We should then know, to within two or three hundred, practically how many horses we have in the towns and in the country.

LORD LOVAT: I do not think the noble Earl has answered Lord Ribblesdale's question. Unless Lord Ribblesdale's hunters are taken out to draw the garden mower, or are used for some agricultural purpose, they would not come under this Return.

*EARL CARRINGTON: We shall have to have an inquisition of my noble friend's horses as well. I believe the number of hunting horses in the stables is known.

LORD LOVAT: By whom is it known?

LORD HENEAGE: Is it not the fact that nothing is known of any horses whatever except agricultural horses?

*EARL CARRINGTON: That is so, but we are considering the best way in which a census of the town horses can be obtained as well.

LORD HENEAGE: And all the country horses?

LORD RIBBLESDALE: I suggest that what is required to be known is the number of horses which would be useful in an emergency, and if you do not get that the census would be no good at all.

*EARL CARRINGTON: I quite agree. I think this is wholly a question of machinery and detail. We have, under our scheme, to get an advisory committee, and we shall be glad to have the advantage of the advice of my noble friend and of any one who will be good enough to help us so that we may get the total number of horses in town and country in England and Ireland.

LORD LOVAT: I should like to ask——

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Really, my Lords, this is becoming so very irregular that I must protest.

*EARL CARRINGTON: As I have said, this is wholly a question of machinery and detail. Though there is no alarm for the present, the future does cause the War Office no little anxiety. As the noble Earl opposite has said, there were 10,000 fewer foals in 1906 than in 1905, and, therefore, it is the duty of the Government, in the agricultural interest as well as in that of the Army, to take the whole matter in hand. The scheme is practically the registration of a large number of suitable stallions, say 500, and of a large number of suitable mares—we ought, eventually, to have no less than 25,000 brood mares. The registration of their stock would be approved by the military authorities, but no stallion or brood animal would be accepted on the breeding register unless, first, it was passed by a civil veterinary surgeon as sound for breeding purposes, and, secondly, by a remount officer certifying it as suitable for Army purposes. All registered breeding animals would thus be officially certified as sound. That is, I think, a most important matter, because it would discredit, if it did not altogether knock out, the unsound stallions that are now travelling about the country. The ultimate object, and it would not take many years, would be to secure the breeding annually of 15,000 foals of the various classes required, so that we might be able at a moment's notice to put our hands on the 70,000 horses required in the case of sudden mobilisation. That relates entirely to the First Line, and does not bring in the Territorials at all.

Then we propose to give a special fee to the stallion owner, in addition to the covering fee, for every registered mare which is found to be in foal to the registered stallion at the end of the covering season. I know a good many people would sooner see the money go to the mares, but I am not certain that this plan would be the better of the two. If you gave a certain amount to each travelling stallion at the end of the covering season it would amount to a very considerable sum, and it would make the owners of these stallions missionaries in the movement. When a mare was brought to the horse the owner of the stallion would ask: Is she registered? If she were not registered he would not get the additional fee, and, therefore, he would urge the owner of the mare to get her registered and procure the certificate of soundness. In that way we think we should have 500 travelling missionaries in the country desirous in their own interests of getting the mares registered. It is also proposed to assist the owners of mares in some cases by the payment of the whole or part of the covering fee. This is intended to assist the small farmer, but the payment of such fees on a large scale could not be undertaken.

Then there is the proposal, which originated and was very much insisted upon two years ago in the speech which the Duke of Portland made on horse breeding in your Lordships' House, of the purchase by the Army of three-year-olds, instead of five-year-old horses. Your Lordships will see that there is a supplementary report advocating that by Sir Walter Gilbey in the Report of the Royal Commission. The difficulty up to the present time on the side of the War Office has been in looking after these three-year-old horses when they have been obtained. The cavalry commanding officers do not want them in their stables; they want animals in a hard condition that they can depend on. Then there is the great expense involved if you have harases or depots where the horses are looked after during the two years which are the most dangerous in their existence. The French plan is to buy three-year-olds in the autumn. The mares are purchased in March or April, and are left with the owner, who feeds and keeps them under inspection and in good condition at light work. But each year a Government stallion is brought into requisition. The foals remain the property of the breeder, and then the mare is taken over by the military authorities in her sixth year, when her second foal is weaned.

Then comes the question of expense. The establishment expenses are necessarily very heavy. The cost for the five or six-year-old horses that pass into the ranks of the French Army is £70 or £80, as compared with £40 here. Some means must be found, if possible, to carry out this idea in a cheaper way. The proposal is that all the young horses which have been selected should be left with their sellers until such time as they were required, a monthly payment being made for their keep for not more than two years. The Army Council would inspect the produce of all breeding stock at three years, and keep a lien on the three-year-old horses selected. This would mean an inspection of, we hope, from 12,000 to 15,000 young horses annually. Then a report would be made to the Board of Agriculture on the remainder of the 12,000 to 15,000 young horses, which would be placed on the register of young horses.

It is next proposed that the Board of Agriculture should be assisted in carrying out the scheme by a consultative committee, on which we hope to induce the representatives of the leading societies who have done so much good in the past to give their aid—such societies as the Brood Mare Society and the Hunters' Improvement Society—as well as noble Lords and other persons whose disinterested activity in the cause is a household word.

There is only one matter I have not dealt with and that is the question of cost. The noble Earl opposite joined organisation and expenditure together. We can be responsible for the organisation, and, with the help of the advisory committee, we hope we may be able to do something practical But expenditure comes under an entirely different head. We have worked out satisfactory figures among the departments concerned, and I am glad to say that we have the entire co-operation of my right hon. friend the Secretary of

State for War, and of the Army Council. The question of expenditure is now being examined by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I need hardly remind your Lordships that the commitments of the Government at present are very large, and it would be to the best interests of the nation that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should have all his liabilities and all the requests submitted before he gave any definite pledge, even on such an important subject as this. The scheme will depend entirely for its success on the support given to it by horse-owners and persons interested in horse-breeding. I hope that, though the scheme may not please everyone, it will receive general support, for it is by some such method as this that the country can alone hope to deal with the question which has in days gone by been a practical danger, and which is considered to be, in present circumstances, a national disgrace.

LORD SALTOUN: I should like to ask the noble Earl whether there is anything in the Government scheme to prevent the foreigner from entering into competition with the Government in either buying mares or their produce; or are they earmarked for the Government in case of war?

EARL CARRINGTON: I am glad that the noble Lord has taken up that question. There is nothing whatever in the scheme to stop the ready sale of horses abroad. I venture to think that that would be a very dangerous thing to do. There is nothing in the scheme to prevent a man from breeding the best kind of barouche horse, or a high-class hunting horse, and exporting it; but we are trying to get enough of the "misfits" and to make them into a better class of horse than they are at present, so as to enable a ready sale to the War Office of horses which are not wanted for other purposes. But there is nothing to hamper the great horse-breeding industry, which brings a great deal of money into this country.

LORD HENEAGE: Do I understand that we are now to have a return of all horses in town and country under a proper classification? I think it is clearly admitted that we have no return whatever except as regards what are called shire horses. Does the noble Earl now intend to have a full return?

EARL CARRINGTON: I am afraid I have not been able to make myself understood. My great desire is to get a census of all the horses in the country, and I hope my noble friend will give me the benefit of his advice and assistance.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lord, I do not desire to press my Motion. I would thank the noble Earl for the trouble he has taken in putting his scheme before us this evening. It would be ungracious on my part to criticise it at such short notice, but I hope the noble Earl will continue pressing the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because the sooner something is done the better. I am sure he will have the unanimous support of your Lordships in pressing him. I may say that I am a little alarmed at the use of the word "misfit" as applied to the horsing of the Army. We have heard of a great many kinds of horses this evening, but I should be sorry to think that the noble Earl's scheme would have such a small result as perhaps would be suggested by his last remark. I hope it will be kept in mind that we want to retain our best horses for ourselves. I am confident that something in the direction of placing difficulties in the way of the foreigner coming in and purchasing our best horses is necessary, and I am not at all certain at the moment that what is now suggested is enough.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

NURSES REGISTRATION BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, in view of the considerable tax which has already been placed upon your Lordships' attention I will endeavour to abbreviate as far as possible what I have to say. I trust your Lordships will allow me to begin by explaining how I come to be in charge of this Bill. Some few weeks ago when I took it upon myself to move the rejection of the Official Directory of Nurses Bill, the Bill which was designed in opposition to this Bill, I explained to the House that I did so of my own motion, and not as the spokesman of any league or body of persons outside this House. The Society for the State Registration of Nurses, however, encouraged by your Lordships' vote on that occasion, and recognising that in view of the state of business in the other House of Parliament their chances of obtaining a hearing for their Bill in that House were becoming less and less, asked me to introduce it in your Lordships' House.

It is, therefore—and I explain this in order that I may not be thought to be sailing under false colours—as the spokesman of that Society that I am here to-day. Diffident though I was about the matter, I could not refuse a request made to me in that way, and I am proud to be the spokesman of a body of women who are engaged in that noble calling which more than any other, I think, brings out the best qualities of the gentler sex. In any circumstances, whether it had been late or not, I should have been very much divided in mind as to whether I should say all those things which the advocates of State Registration would wish me to say on behalf of their cause, or whether I should avoid trespassing unduly upon your Lordships' attention and patience. I hope that I am safe in yielding to the latter consideration, relying on the very great practical knowledge and experience which most of your Lordships have of those conditions of our social life which are affected by the proposed legislation.

The question is one of very great importance. It has been agitated for twenty years past; it has formed the subject of an exhaustive inquiry on the part of a Committee of the House of Commons which sat during two sessions; and whereever it has arisen elsewhere, whether it be in foreign countries or in our own Colonies, owing to the organisation of nurses it has led to legislation very similar to that which is now proposed. The noble Earl the Leader of the House, speaking with all the responsibility of his position as Lord President of the Council, the Department which is particularly concerned, said, on March 8, 1905, that the subject was one of national importance, and that it could not be long before it engaged the serious attention of Parliament; and the noble Earl added that it was also apparent that there was a strong preponderance of opinion in favour of the scheme of State registration. But I hope it will not be considered presumption on my part if I venture to quote an even more important utterance. His Majesty the King, speaking on Saturday at the opening of the buildings for the Royal National Pension Fund for Nurses, spoke as follows:—

> "It has now, happily, long been recognised that in the alleviation of pain and sickness, good nursing is of supreme importance, and that it is in the interests of the community that measures should be taken to obtain skilled and efficient nurses in increased numbers and to procure for them such advantages and prospects as will retain them in their profession."

Of course, I do not presume for one moment to guess what was in His Majesty's mind, but this I do know, that there is no measure which, in the opinion of the great majority of the nursing and medical professions, would be better calculated to secure that end than a measure of the kind now before your Lordships. Registration is, indeed, an essential preliminary to any further steps for increasing the efficiency and improving the prospects of the nursing profession.

Again, I would venture to suggest to your Lordships that in these days of the feminist movement Parliament would do well to pay careful attention to a demand which is put forward with steady persistence but with perfect propriety by a body of women whose services to the community are both unquestioned and indispensable. Whether we be advocates of woman suffrage or whether we be opposed to that policy, we are equally concerned, I think, as politicians, to see that such a demand is treated with due respect.

So much for the general importance of the question. It behoves me to explain —and I will do so as briefly as possible— the objects, reasons, and nature of the demand for the legislation proposed in this Bill. In other words, I have to show the House what is demanded, why it is demanded, and by whom it is demanded. In the first place, then, what the nurses—and with them are associated many who do not belong to the profession—ask for is this. I will give it to your Lordships in their own words. They ask that—

> "The term 'trained nurse' shall have a definite meaning; that anyone using it shall submit to a definite examination and satisfy an authority appointed by the State that he or she possesses the qualifications necessary to render him or her a safe attendant on the sick, and that the names of those who attain the prescribed standard shall be entered on a nursing register so that the public may be enabled easily to distinguish qualified from unqualified nurses."

That is the whole extent of the demand. What is asked for, in fact, is that nurses should be treated by the State in the same way as solicitors, physicians, surgeons, dentists, and even midwives are already treated; that, in view of the increased demands for efficiency which have been made, and which the nurses themselves have done so much to meet, there should be extended to them the legislation which has developed on uniform and well-established principles in respect to kindred professions, not only in this country but also in the British Colonies.

Next, what are the reasons for this demand? Speaking in general terms, it is for the protection of the public just as much as for the protection of the nurses themselves; but it is necessary, I think, that I should explain this point a little further. In the first place, then, there exist at the present moment no standards of nursing education, and the consequence is that the value of training and of the consequent certificates which are given by the different institutions regarded as nursing schools vary considerably. Indeed, there are as many opinions as to what constitutes a sufficient training and as to what amount of training entitles a nurse to a certificate as there are nursing schools and similar institutions. In a great many of these institutions there is no doubt that a very inefficient training is given to the nurses. This is unfair to the nurses, who pay for the training by a very great sacrifice of time, if not of money, and it is unfair to the public, who are unable to judge of the relative value of these certificates. What is wanted, then, is an educational authority which would be able to lay down what the standard of training entitling a nurse to a certificate should be. The lay governors of hospitals, admirable though their work is, and greatly experienced though many of them are, are not exactly in the position to lay down standards of this kind, and certainly they have no means of all agreeing together what the standards should be and of enforcing them. Again, owing to the lack of a governing body for the nursing profession, the certificate of a nurse cannot be withdrawn even where she has been convicted of crime, and this, as I shall show your Lordships, is a very serious matter indeed. I might go on to refer to the absence of any standard for matrons and of any regulation that those who fill the highly important and responsible position of matron of a hospital or nursing home should be required to go through further tests, but I hardly think that is necessary for my present purpose.

I hope I have said enough to show that, in the absence of the safeguards which belong to other professions, the public suffer so far as the nursing profession is concerned, and, at the same time, the nurses suffer when discredit is thrown on their profession on occasions when unqualified persons use the name of nurse for improper and dishonest purposes. I could give your Lordships a great many instances. I have, in fact, a very large supply of them here, but I hardly think it is necessary to give them in view of the fact that most of your Lordships must, in the course of your ordinary everyday experience, have come across cases of the kind which I have in my mind. It is a matter of common knowledge that the nursing homes for the care of private patients are under no supervision. There is no guarantee whatever that the patients receive the skilled nursing for which they pay. In some cases—in a good few cases, I believe—these nursing homes are commercial speculations on the part of unprofessional persons who make their profit by enabling those who do not care to go through the long grind of a thorough hospital training to take away a certificate of nurse and to trade upon it. Some of these homes are even worse, and are simply places where abortion is practised and which are centres of immorality and crime.

Perhaps I might just give your Lordships three very brief instances of what I mean. Sir Victor Horsley told the Select Committee of the House of Commons that in a nursing home to which he himself frequently sent patients, he recognised a scrubber dressed up as a nurse and attending to one of his patients. That is an instance of the kind of fraud which can be perpetrated even in a perfectly well-known and respectable nursing institution under such distinguished supervision as that of Sir Victor Horsley. A graver case is that of the two women who were hanged at Holloway in consequence of abominable crimes in 1903. The newspapers at the time were filled with sensational headlines, and the placards in the streets contained such announcements as "Nurses charged with murder." I need hardly explain how painfully the nursing profession suffer from episodes of this kind, and thus having the name of their profession associated with criminals. The third instance is quite a recent one. It is that of the woman who went by the *alias* of Princess Soltikoff, whose case was notorious a couple of years ago, and who was sentenced at the Old Bailey to fifteen months' hard labour for fraud in 1906. She had previously been sentenced for a similar crime in 1903, but between these two convictions she had four or five situations as a nurse and had been in several hospitals. That, my Lords, is an instance of the possibilities for criminally-disposed persons in the present absence of safeguards. I trust I have said enough to show your Lordships how essential it is that the public should have means of distinguishing efficient nurses from criminals who pose as members of a profession to which they do not belong and on which they bring great discredit and shame.

Next, my Lords, I have to tell you who make this demand for legislation. It is, in the first place, practically the whole of the organised body of the nursing profession; secondly, practically the whole of the medical profession; and, thirdly, a number of important bodies concerned with women's work. I am quite prepared to substantiate this statement, but in view of my undertaking not to occupy very much of your Lordships' time I trust it will be taken for granted. The position is this. The number of nurses in this country has been variously estimated, and there is no certain information, just as in the case of the horses we have been discussing. But what is quite certain is that, of the total number of nurses, nearly all those who are organised in leagues and associations have expressed themselves in favour of State registration. The number who have so declared in favour of this policy is about 10,000. I have the whole of the details here, but as I trust that the assertion which was made on the former occasion that the movement was really got up on the principle of a stage army—a most unfair and unjustifiable statement—will not be made again, I will not use my figures unless I am obliged to do so. Then there are a great many nurses who do not belong to leagues and associations, and who have individually expressed themselves in favour of legislation. Scottish nurses are not organised, but it is well known that they have complete confidence in a very representative body called the Scottish Registration Committee. Lastly, I should like to point out that a great many nurses are not free to give an unbiassed opinion on this subject, and have therefore remained silent.

I said that practically the whole of the medical profession are in favour of it. The General Medical Council pronounced in favour of the principle of State registration so far back as 1889, and the British Medical Association, which is composed of 21,000 medical practitioners —about two-thirds of the whole profession—has passed formal resolutions in favour of State registration on three occasions—in 1895, in 1904, and in 1906. The most important of those votes was that which took place in 1906, when ninety out of ninety-three Members present voted for the resolution in favour of State registration, and that was after two years consideration of the subject in the constituencies which were represented at the meeting. I think that fact fully justifies me in saying that practically the whole of the medical profession are in favour of the State registration of nurses. Then I mentioned that there were a number of important bodies engaged in women's work who supported this Bill. I refer to the Asylum Workers Association, the National Union of Women Workers, and the Women's Industrial Council. The Committee of the House of Commons took exhaustive evidence, and on the question of principle expressed themselves as follows—

> "Your Committee are agreed that it is desirable that a register of nurses should be kept by a central body appointed by the State."

That opinion, I understand, was endorsed by the Lord-President of the Council, speaking with all the responsibility of head of the Department particularly concerned. There is yet one more reason which I should like to urge before I go on actually to the Bill, and that is that midwives, whose training is infinitely less than that which is required of a skilled nurse—a matter of two months as against three years—are already registered on precisely the same principles as those advocated in this Bill. What is the opposition ? I do not think I need go over that ground, as the opposition was, I think, fully disposed of by your Lordships' vote—a vote of three to one, I think it was—on the Official Directory of Nurses Bill.

I will, therefore, go on to explain, in a very few words, what the Bill actually does. I may say that the Bill has been five times before the House of Commons, and it has been backed by Members of every Party, but owing to ill-luck it has never gained a place in the ballot and has therefore never come up for Second Reading. The actual scope of the Bill, as to which I find there is a certain amount of doubt, is very well defined in the preamble—

> "Whereas it is expedient that persons requiring nursing assistance should be enabled to distinguish qualified from unqualified nurses."

The Bill really does not go beyond that. It enables the public to distinguish qualified from unqualified nurses, and that is no less an advantage to the public than it is to the nurses themselves. Then you will see that there are certain temporary provisions in Sections 3, 4 and 5; they provide for a temporary or provisional council to register persons already in practice as trained nurses in order that a constituency may be formed which would elect representatives of the nursing profession on the regular council. The most important of the permanent provisions is Section 6 which proposes that a council should be incorporated by the name of the general Council of Nursing Education and Registration of the United Kingdom.

I hope it that is not necessary to go any further into detail. I have heard it suggested that the actual composition of the council which is proposed might be the subject of criticism, but I venture to think that that is a matter of detail which really does not affect the principle of the Bill, with which alone we are concerned at the present moment. But I might say, parenthetically, first of all that the number of representatives has been reduced from thirty-one, as it appeared in the original Bill before the House of Commons, to nineteen. This was done in deference to the views of the Select Committee of the House of Commons. Secondly, it has to be borne in mind that three classes have to be represented—the nurses, the medical practitioners, and the public. At the same time it is necessary to provide representation for England and Wales, for Scotland, and for Ireland. I think, however, that the exact proportion of representatives of each class, and the adaptation of that representation to the three countries, is a matter which can be discussed in Committee if your Lordships are good enough to allow the Bill to proceed so far.

I will only reiterate that the question which is before us is simply this, whether the State shall do for nurses what it has done for kindred professions, and enable the public to distinguish the qualified from the unqualified. I should like to explain, in view of another possible misapprehension, that there is no desire—and I am advised there is no possibility as the Bill is drafted—to interfere with the liberty of contract between the sick and any person attending them for hire. All that the Bill would do, or could do, as it is at present drafted, is to protect the title "registered nurse" for the use of those who have attained a minimum standard as defined by the authority. I trust I have said enough to induce your Lordships to give a Second Reading to this Bill, and thus, I venture to think, to give encouragement to that noble profession in which women display from day to day skill, courage, devotion to duty, and self-sacrifice well comparable with those of sailors and soldiers in times of danger and warfare, and in which they set an example to our race of the highest qualities of Christian humanity.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

*Lord KINNAIRD: My Lords, I do not know whether the noble Lord who introduced this Bill has any figures with regard to the total number of nurses that exist and the number whom it is anticipated will become registered under this Bill. It is very desirable that the idea should not get about that anyone is good enough to nurse the poor, and that we only want to register a small class of nurses for the hospitals and the upper classes. That is one of the dangers of the provisions in this Bill, and it is one of the points which will have to be carefully guarded against.

Lord AMPTHILL: I beg the noble Lord's pardon for interrupting him. I thought I had answered his objection in almost my last sentence, when I said that the Bill was so drawn that it could not interfere with liberty of contract between the sick and those whom they engage to attend upon them. Therefore, district nurses and Poor Law nurses would not be affected at all. It would be a case of registering nurses with a certain standard of qualification and not of interfering with others.

*Lord KINNAIRD: Many of those interested in district nursing feel strongly that in the case of that class of nurses, who, for all practical purposes, are fully qualified nurses and do their work thoroughly well, it would be very hard for them to be described as "unqualified." The difficulty will be increased of raising funds for district nursing if the district nurses are, under this Bill, to be "unqualified"; and, if they receive the necessary training to become registered, they will be less qualified than they are at present to do a great deal of the district nursing work. Many of those who have obtained the higher class of training are not equally as qualified as they were before for doing this kind of work and for looking after the poor in their homes. I do not wish to oppose the Second Reading of this Bill, but I think that when we come to details there will be many matters to be considered. It would be very hard upon the class to whom I have referred, and who do very valuable work, if they were described as unqualified, and I hope before the Bill leaves your Lordship's House steps will be taken to prevent these disadvantages and disqualifications being put upon a very deserving class of women.

*The Earl of CREWE: My Lords, it is a little unfortunate that a subject of this considerable importance should have come before us in such a thin House, because I do not think that the numbers here present correctly indicate the interest which is taken in the subject. But the fact does, I think, add greatly to our difficulty in arriving at a conclusion as to what course we ought to take with regard to this Bill. This question of registration has, as we all know, been before the country for some considerable time. The principle was approved by an important Select Committee which was held on the subject, and in considering the whole question we ought to bear the fact in mind that the Report of the Committee did undoubtedly approve of the principle of the registration of nurses.

When the matter came before me two years ago when I was Lord President, I said, in reply to a deputation, that I did not think it would be much use attempting to proceed with the matter until there was some practical unanimity among nurses themselves, and also—which was of equal importance—the medical profession as to the manner in which the thing could be done, because it is one thing to approve of the idea of registration and another thing to attempt to put it into practice. I do not know, and I have no reason to suppose, that that requisite degree of agreement has been arrived at. The noble Lord who proposed the Second Reading of the

Bill spoke of the practical unanimity of nurses. I have no doubt that a very considerable majority of nurses are in favour of registration, and would undoubtedly be in favour of the kind of registration in this particular Bill, because it gives nurses practically the entire control of the council with a small sprinkling of the medical element. But when we come to the medical profession, I take it the case is very different.

The noble Lord said that the medical profession were practically unanimous in favour of the registration of nurses. When this matter was before the Select Committee a protest was made by a number of people, including several hundred doctors, against the principle of registration, among them being Lord Lister, Dr. Allchin, Sir James Reid, Sir Thomas Barlow, Sir William Bennett, Dr. Watson Cheyne, Dr. Ferrier, and a great many more, and there was a second list including a great many other extremely well-known doctors. Therefore to talk of the practical unanimity of the medical profession on the subject seems to me to be going considerably beyond the mark.

I do not think that this matter ought to be by any means dismissed, because I believe that a very considerable majority of the nursing profession do desire to see some form of registration, and I quite agree with everything the noble Lord said as to the deference we ought to pay to the members of so honourable and respected a profession. What exactly the nurses are going to get out of this particular form of registration is another matter. The noble Lord on the cross benches drew attention to the fact that a considerable number of nurses who really cannot be called untrained or incompetent would have something like a stigma put upon them by this Bill, and the Local Government Board no doubt would have something to say also on that subject with regard to the nurses whom they employ. Then the noble Lord spoke of a case where two women were charged with murder and were afterwards hanged, and in connection with which placards were displayed in the street announcing: "Nurses charged with murder." No amount of registration will prevent that. You will not be able to confine the title of nurse to these particular registered ladies. There is no penalty in the Bill for any woman calling herself a nurse or wearing the uniform of a nurse, and therefore, I am afraid the profession will not escape that unfortunate possibility, to say nothing of the fact that if a person was going to commit murder the fact that she had been trained for three years in a hospital would not prevent her doing so.

But there is another side to this question, and that is the interest of the public in it. The other day, as your Lordships remember, a Bill for establishing a Directory of Nurses was thrown out on Second Reading by a very considerable majority. Looking at this matter, as I think I do, impartially, I am bound to say that, so far as the public is concerned, this registration will not be of much more, if of any more, value than the lists of names in a Directory. Unless you can devise some means for ensuring a continual guarantee of the efficiency and character of a nurse, the mere fact that she passed certain examinations a certain number of years ago is not much use to the patient who is going to engage her. So far as it is of any use, that bare knowledge would be equally well supplied by the Directory. That is a very important, and, I think, a very crucial point in connection with this Bill. No attempt is made, so far as I can see, in this Bill for anything to be done beyond a statement of the fact that a nurse has at some time or other been efficiently trained, and she is asked to pay £5 for that statement. It is also true that if she is convicted, or appears in the Divorce Court, or does something which brings her name prominently before public notice, she will be struck off the Register, but there is no guarantee that she has not gone downhill in other ways, that she has not lost her efficiency or even her character, and therefore the public must realise that if anything of this kind be done there is no more guarantee of the conduct or even of the capacity of the nurse at the moment at which she is engaged than the fact that she passed certain examinations, five, ten or fifteen years ago. Therefore, from the public point of view, the Bill does not seem to me to do very much more than the Directory Bill did which your Lordships refused to consider.

Under these circumstances, my Lords, I confess I rather question whether at this period of the session it is worth while to read the Bill a second time. I have no kind of hostility to its principle, as I have often said, and I should like to see it carried into effect; but I have a certain abhorrence of the practice of reading Bills a second time in this House when there is no prospect of continuing them, more especially in such a very thin House as there is here to-night. I think we ought to demand a little more evidence of the interest of the House in the subject before we can pledge the House of Lords to a certain extent, because it must not be forgotten that a Second Reading, after all, does mean something, to the principle of the Bill. In that matter I am very much in your Lordships' hands. I certainly should not desire to move the rejection of the Bill; far from it; but under the circumstances I confess I question whether your Lordships would do wisely to read the Bill a second time to-night.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I entirely agree with the noble Earl that the condition of our Benches this evening is not favourable to the final discussion of so important a question as that with which this Bill deals, but I think I should use that rather as an argument against the summary rejection of the Bill. On the other hand, I think if your Lordships decide to give a Second Reading to the Bill we are entitled to claim that in doing so we are by no means committed to an acceptance of the full scheme which is embodied in it.

Speaking for myself, and for myself only, I may say that I am upon the whole in sympathy with the main object of my noble friend behind me. The principle of his Bill amounts, as I understand it, to no more than this, that he desires to afford to the public some means of ascertaining whether a woman who calls herself a nurse has or has not obtained at any rate a minimum of experience and training in her profession. That seems to me to be reasonable, both from the point of view of the nurses, and from the point of view of the public who employ them. What are the alternatives before us? We may leave things exactly as they are at the present time. I must say that a strong case has been made for the view that the present condition of things, under which the public has no guarantee whatever as to the fitness of a person who calls herself a nurse, is very unsatisfactory. Then we have the alternative embodied in the Directory of Nurses Bill, which your Lordships rejected for reasons which were fully stated at the time. There remains the third course, that of registration, and that has certainly received a good deal of official encouragement from the medical profession and from the nursing profession itself.

The noble Earl said with some force: "What is the value of the kind of registration which this Bill contemplates?" I certainly should not over-rate its value, but I think it is worth something. It is not a complete guarantee of the nurse's qualifications, but it is a guarantee of something. It proves that she has, at any rate, during her life acquired the ground-work of a knowledge of the most important elements of her profession, those elements which are really most indispensable to the proper performance of her duties. It is perfectly true that registration affords no guarantee that the nurse possesses those other qualities for which we look, and so often look not in vain, in members of the nursing profession; but, then, surely it will be just as possible for people after this Bill has passed, supposing it to pass, to satisfy themselves as to those other points—as to the nurse's character, demeanour, and so forth—as it is at the present moment for them when they employ a nurse who has no certificate and has never been registered. I think moreover it may be fairly argued that those technical attainments without which a nurse would be unable to obtain a certificate are, in fact, those which are most indispensable for her efficiency.

The noble Earl says that the nurse's certificate would not be a guarantee of her continuing fitness. This is perfectly true, but it does not profess to be a guarantee of her continuing fitness. What it professes to show is that she has at one time acquired that groundwork of knowledge upon which my noble friends insists. What, then, are we to do with this Bill? I should, I confess, be very sorry if we were to reject it. The idea of taking a division upon so important a subject in so thin a House as this seems to me almost out of the question. I cannot help thinking that the proper course, in the circumstances, is to give the Bill a Second Reading, upon the assumption that by doing so we are committed to no more than what I would call the bare principle of the measure. There will be other opportunities of discussing points of detail in Committee, and there will be another opportunity, of which we in this House very often take advantage, for a further discussion upon the Motion to go into Committee. If, therefore, your Lordships are good enough to desire to know my opinion, I would venture to suggest that my noble friend's Motion should not be opposed and that we should reserve to ourselves the right to continue this discussion under more favourable circumstances.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, I do not rise to discuss this Bill. There is much to be said in its favour, and much to criticise; but I would suggest to your Lordships, in view of the time and the state of the House, that the debate should be adjourned. If a division were challenged the number of Peers present is too small to allow of a division being taken, and what would happen would amount to what in the House of Commons would be called a count out. I should have been glad myself to have said a little on the motion for the Second Reading, and I would urge that the debate should be adjourned. I will formally move that, but if the feeling of the House is against me, I will not press the motion.

Moved, "That the debate be adjourned."—(*Lord Stanley of Alderley.*)

LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, on that motion I should like to say that it would seem to me a pity to adjourn the debate. I cannot see what the object of that course can be. I have not heard of anybody else who was desirous of speaking on the Second Reading, but, as the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition said, there will be further opportunities of discussing the Bill, both on principle and in detail. If there were any appreciable number of Peers who wished to speak I should be entirely for an adjournment, but I think in all the circumstances, the best course would be to allow the Bill to be read a second time to-day.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I think we might get over the difficulty by adopting the suggestion of the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition. As we are allowed, I understand, by the rules of the House, to make Second Reading Speeches on the Motion to go into Committee, I think that covers the ground, and that we might very well accept the bare principle of the Bill to-day. I should like to speak upon the Bill myself, as it will affect the district nurses in Ireland.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: I withdraw my Motion.

Motion for the adjournment, by leave, withdrawn.

On Question, original Motion agreed to. Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION BILL [H.L.]

House in Committee (according to order). An Amendment made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendment to be received To-morrow; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 131.)

COMMONS BILL [H.L.]

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read and discharged.

House adjourned at five minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 6th July, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill; Seaham Harbour Dock Bill; Southwell District Gas Bill; Stockport Corporation Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Merthyr Tydfil Corporation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Bristol Corporation Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill [Lords]; Honourable Artillery Company Bill [Lords]; Tollemache Estate Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Wednesday.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J.).

Mr. PARTINGTON reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Wednesday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation Bill.

Amendments to:—Swansea Valley Gas Bill [Lords], now Tawe Valley Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Bridgwater, Llandudno, and Whitley Bay." [Piers and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under The General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Rothesay." [Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Brough Water, Burgess Hill Water, Earby and Thornton Gas, East Hull Gas, Sevenoaks, Water, and Stourbridge Water." [Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Caldicot and District Gas, Rainford Gas, Rothwell Gas, Tenterden and District Gas, and Woolmer and District Gas." [Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Liverpool Corporation Tramways Extensions and Potteries and North Staffordshire Tramways (Amendment)." [Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to Troon (Loch Bradan) Water." [Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 296.]

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 297.]

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 298.]

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 299.]

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 300.]

Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and ordered (under Section 9 of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 301.]

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) (No. 2) BILL.

Petitions against: From Airdrie; Beddington; Cardiff; Carshalton; Coalville; Dundee (six); Exeter; Lockerbie; London (four); Oldhom; Southampton (two); Tilbury Docks; Turnford; and Wallington; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Gloucester, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Beeston, against alteration of Clause 20; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Ayr, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Hackney, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

Account presented, showing the Receipt and Expenditure of Naval Prize, Bounty, Salvage, and other Moneys between 1st April, 1907, and 31st March, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 208.]

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903 during the month of October, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 19, 1908).

Copy presented, of Note exchanged between the United Kingdom and Sweden and Norway relative to the Agreement of 12th July, 1881, for the Mutual Relief of Distressed Seamen. November, 1907, to May, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Accounts presented, of all Deposits received and paid during the year ended 31st December, 1907, together with a Statement showing the aggregate amount of the liabilities of the Government to Depositors in the Post Office Savings Banks on 31st December, 1907, and the nature and amount of the Securities held by the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt to meet those Liabilities at that date [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 209.]

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Friendly Societies, Workmen's Compensation Schemes, Industrial and Provident Societies, and Trade Unions, Reports of the Chief Registrar for the year ending 31st December, 1907 [by Act]; to be printed [No. 210].

Building Societies, Copy of Thirteenth Annual Report by the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies of the Proceedings of the Registrars under the Building Societies Acts, etc., [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 211.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

English Historical Monuments Suggested Royal Commission.

MR. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the Prime Minister whether a letter has been received by him asking for the appointment of a Royal Commission for England and Wales, to be appointed on the lines of the existing Commission on Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions in Scotland; and whether the letter was signed officially by the right hon. Lord Avebury, on behalf of the Society of Antiquaries, by Sir E. J. Poynter, Bart., President of the Royal Academy, and by Mr. T. E. Collcutt, President of the Royal Institute of British Architects.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I have received communications from the bodies mentioned recommending the appointment of a Royal Commission for England and Wales.

Post Office Charge Clerks in North of Ireland.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state how many charge clerks there are in the Northern District of Ireland; whether the officer now in charge at Crumlin, County Antrim, is one of these, and receiving the allowance; and, if not, whether he will state why a charge clerk was not sent to this office.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There is no class of charge clerks in the Northern District of Ireland or elsewhere. When it is necessary to send an established officer to take charge of an office he is selected from a list of suitable officers kept by the surveyor. In the case referred to by the hon. Member it is not necessary to employ an established officer.

The Superannuation (Post Office and War Office) Act, 1876.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): To ask the Postmaster-General whether Clause 5 of the Superannuation (Post Office and War Office) Act, 1876, was complied with; whether the Treasury laid before Parliament the Return showing the names of all persons with respect to whom any order or warrant was issued in pursuance of the said Act; whether he will state if complete lists of all persons who were affected by this Act were complied by the officials of that period; and whether such lists are still in existence at post offices where such officers are employed.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Return was laid before Parliament in accordance with the terms of the Act, and was ordered by the House of Commons to be printed on 4th May, 1877. Copies of the Return are still in existence and are referred to from time to time as occasion demands.

SIR G. KEKEWICH: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that under the Superannuation Act, 1859, it is enacted that compulsory retirement shall take place at the age of sixty-five, he can state why it was necessary to fix the compulsory retirement age at sixty in the Superannuation (Post Office and War Office) Act, 1876, and if any officers scheduled under this Act are retained after sixty years of age; whether he will lay Papers upon the Table stating the special reasons why the said officers are retained; and whether, in all such cases, paragraph 3 of subsection (*d*) of Clause 2 was duly enforced.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Superannuation (Post Office and War Office) Act, 1876, was repealed by the Statute Law Revision Act, 1883, and, therefore, the special age limit of sixty no longer applies to the officers whose appointments were confirmed under the Act of 1876. I do not know why the age of sixty was fixed by the Act of 1876 as the age for compulsory retirement; but I may point out that the Superannuation Act of 1859 does not lay down any age limit. The limit of sixty-five years is fixed by the Orders in Council of 15th August, 1890, and 29th November, 1898.

Scottish Judges as Bank Directors.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Prime Minister if he has any official information as to how many of the Judges of the Court of Session and of the Sheriffs in Scotland occupy the position of directors of the Scottish Banks; whether he is aware that the fact that these two offices are so often combined tends to prevent the public entering upon litigation against the banks; and whether he will, in future appointments of judges, make it a condition that they shall not accept such posts in trading concerns.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I have no official information on the matters referred to by my hon. friend, but I understand that the only position ever now held by Judges of the Court of Session in Scottish banks is that of extraordinary director, which entails no duty and carries no salary. I assume that the same principles apply to ordinary trading concerns. It appears to me to be highly undesirable that a Member of the Bench should take an active part in the direction of a commercial company.

Reduction of the Sinking Fund.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if it has been decided that four millions sterling are to be obtained by reducing the new Sinking Fund from ten and a-half millions to six and a-half millions sterling.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Sinking Fund portion of the fixed debt charged for the current year is estimated to amount to £9,785,000. There is no intention of reducing that amount in the current year.

The Bank of Ireland Directors.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been directed to the action of Alderman Corrigan against Mr. Edward R. Read, the chairman of the late National Assurance Company of Ireland, which was at hearing for twelve days in Dublin before Mr. Justice Andrews and a special jury, and resulted on Thursday, 26th June, in the verdict of the jury, who found that Alderman Corrigan had been induced to purchase 1,000 shares in the National Assurance Company by the representations made in the reports and speeches of the chairman and directors, that these representations were untrue, that the defendant knew them to be untrue, and that as a consequence the plaintiff lost over £6,500 by the transaction; whether he is aware that on the Bank of Ireland list of directors are no fewer than four directors of the expired National Assurance Company, and that the National Assurance Company was accommodated by overdrafts up to £90,000 by the Bank of Ireland, by which the directors were enabled to conceal its true position and to postpone its winding-up, to the ruin of the shareholders; and whether, having regard to the fact that the Government accounts are kept in the Bank of Ireland, and that the late Treasury Remembrancer in Dublin Castle became a director of the Bank of Ireland while still holding the office of Treasury Remembrancer, the Government contemplate, in view of to revelations in the case of Corrigan *v.* Read, and in the public interest, any, and, if so, what, change in their relations with the Bank of Ireland and their dealings with it in preference to other banking institutions in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Answer is in the negative.

Restoration of Evicted Tenants on the Tredennick Estate.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any progress is being made in the movement for the restoration of the former tenants of the townland of Derryonagh, on the Tredennick estate, County Roscommon; whether it is now two years since the farms from which they were evicted were offered for sale to the Estates Commissioners by the agent for the estate with a view to securing the reinstatement of the tenants in question; and whether any steps can be taken to expedite matters.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) The Estates Commissioners were for some time in negotiations with the owner for the purchase of the property in question, but an agreement as to price could not be arrived at and the negotiations were abandoned. The Commissioners received six applications for reinstatement on the estate, but they do not intend to take action in any of these cases, and consequently they do not propose to reopen the negoitations for purchase.

Police at Public Meeting at Kilmurray.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state why a large force of police was ordered to attend a public meeting held at Kilmurray, Sixmile Bridge, County Clare, last month; and whether the presence of so large a force was in any way necessary.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) The police authorities inform me that on the occasion in question a demonstration was organised for the purpose of denouncing an obnoxious person who resides in the neighbourhood, and the police were directed to attend in order to prevent intimidation, and generally to preserve the peace.

Congested Districts Board—Amount Spent on Wages.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the amount spent in wages by the Congested Districts Board from 1st May to 1st July on the various properties of the Board in connection with improvement schemes.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) During the two months referred to the sum of about £9,400 was expended in wages by the Congested Districts Board upon the improvement of estates.

Drainage of the River Robe.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the reasons why the Congested Districts Board were unable to carry out the drainage of the River Robe, in the county of Mayo; and whether, in view of the loss suffered by the small holders adjoining the river through want of effective drainage, he will ask the Congested Districts Board to reconsider the question with a view to having the river drained.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) I would refer to my right hon. friend's Answer to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for South Mayo on 14th April last.

Restoration of Evicted Tenants in County Kerry.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of evicted tenants in Kerry; how many evicted tenants have been reinstated in their own or other farms by the Estates Commissioners; and how many have been reinstated by the landlord.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) Up to 31st May last the Estates Commissioners had received 957 applications from evicted tenants in County Kerry. Of these thirty-nine have been reinstated or provided with new holdings by the Commissioners, eight have been reinstated by the landlords at the instance of the Commissioners, and 207 have been reinstated by landlords, some prior to and others subsequent to the passing of The Irish Land Act, 1903. 359 applications have been refused by the Commissioners, and the names of 210 applicants have been noted upon the list of persons suitable to receive holdings if such can be provided. The Commissioners have no information as to the number of persons evicted in the county, as they deal only with those evicted tenants who apply to them.

Irish Primary Education Grants.

MR. J. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is prepared, before finally deciding on the new method of allocation of the supplementary grant for primary education, to take steps to ascertain the opinions of the executive of the teachers' organisation on the subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) My right hon. friend is prepared to consider any representations which the teachers' organisation may think fit to make to him, but he does not feel called upon to approach them in the matter.

The Canadian Militia and the Ross Rifle

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Government of Canada have decided to re-arm the Canadian

Militia with the Ross rifle in place of the Lee-Enfields now in use; whether this change is being made owing to the superiority of the Ross rifle; and whether thorough trials or tests have been carried out with the Ross rifle in this country, and with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The Canadian Government is completing the arming of its Militia with the Ross rifle. The reasons for the adoption of this rifle by the Canadian Government are not known. The rifle was thoroughly tested in this country, and was not considered superior to the Lee-Enfield rifle.

The Harvester Excise Act in Australia.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the decision of the Federal High Court of Australia that the Federal Excise Act, commonly known as the Harvester Excise Act, which regulated wages in the case of the manufacture of agricultural implements by means of Excise duties levied when wages were not adjudged to be fair and reasonable, and which two manufacturers contended was bad law, was outside the power of taxation conferred by the constitutions; whether the Act was supported by the Australian Labour Party on the express understanding that wages were to be screwed up by Excise duties so as to compensate the workmen for the increased cost of commodities caused by the tariff; whether any information was forthcoming with regard to the working of the Act prior to the decision of the Federal High Court; how many of the Colonies are affected by the decision; and whether he would consider the advisability of issuing a special Report n the subject.

(*Answered by Colonel Seely.*) I have observed telegraphic reports in the Press of the decision of the Commonwealth High Court referred to by my hon. friend. I believe the Act had the support of the Labour Party in Australia, but I cannot, of course, express any opinion as to the grounds of their support. I have no information as to the working of the Act, which applies to all the states of the Commonwealth. The Secretary of State is not in a position to issue any special Report on the subject.

Split Duties in Hull Post Office.

MR. FERENS (Hull, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, despite the recommendation of the Hobhouse Committee in regard to split duties, the postmaster of Hull has recently increased these duties on the female side by over 100 per cent., and on the male side to a considerable extent; and whether he will make inquiry as to the necessity for this step and why the recommendations of the Hobhouse Committee have not been carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The recommendation of the Parliamentary Committee to restrict the number of split duties as far as possible has not been lost sight of, but I find that it has unfortunately been found necessary to increase the number of such duties at Hull in order to adjust the staff to the requirements of the service and to obviate the performance of overtime. But I am making further inquiry into the matter.

Thursday Evening Postal Delivery at Banchory.

CAPTAIN ARTHUR MURRAY (Kincardineshire): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a majority of the residents of Banchory desire the Thursday evening postal delivery, which was recently discontinued, to be resumed; and whether he will issue instructions to the effect that this should be done.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Thursday evening delivery at Banchory was discontinued, with the assent of the town council, in order to afford the postmen partial relief from duty on one day in the week, as in the case of many other officers. Some complaints from the public have been received, but it is not clear that the restoration of the delivery is desired by a majority of the residents. I propose, however, to consult the town council again in order to ascertain from them whether they, as the local representatives of the public, are of opinion that the concession to the postmen should be withdrawn.

Post Office Territorials and Camp Leave.

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will state approximately in what proportion of cases it will be possible for Post Office servants who are members of the Territorial Force to go to camp without providing substitutes; whether the order recently issued with regard to leave for camp will in effect mean that no men in the Post Office service will be able to attend camp without sacrificing the greater part of their civil pay; and whether he can state the number of men in the Post Office service requiring leave of absence for Territorial camps.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I regret that I am unable to state, even approximately, what proportion of the Post Office members of the Territorial Force will be able to attend camp on special leave without providing substitutes; I fear, however, it must necessarily be a small proportion only, as no reserve of staff is provided to meet such cases and the work of absentees must be dealt with from day to day. Moreover, the officers are away at the time of year when the staff is most depleted by holiday leave. The recent regulations issued by the Treasury with regard to leave to Civil Service members of the Territorial Force to enable them to attend camp will no doubt involve the sacrifice by most of the Post Office men concerned of a considerable portion of their civil pay unless they attend camp during their ordinary holiday. I shall not be in a position to state the number of men in the Post Office service who required leave for the purpose of attending camp until after the close of the training season.

Prevention of Tramcar Accidents.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if the Board of Trade has power to insist upon the application to every tramcar of some appliance to prevent accidents; and if it can require the best known for that purpose.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Tramcars worked by mechanical power are subject to regulations made by the Board of Trade, which requires suitable lifeguards, brakes, etc. If any type of such appliances showed undoubted superiority its use could be required by regulation.

Irish Trade Statistics.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received representations from the Belfast Chamber of Commerce in favour of the separate classification in the official Returns of Irish imports and exports, not only in regard to foreign countries but also in regard to England and Scotland; and whether he has come to any decision in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The only representations on the subject received from the Belfast Chamber were addressed to the Departmental Committee which is now sitting to consider how far any change is desirable in the form in which the Trade Accounts of the United Kingdom are published as regards the countries from which imports are received and to which exports are sent. I understand, however, that the Committee are of opinion that this matter does not fall within their terms of reference. I will give careful consideration to any views which the Belfast Chamber may lay before me, but, as the hon. Member is probably aware, the question bristles with difficulties and could not be dealt with without legislation.

Compulsory Attendance at Church of School Children at Wheatley (Oxon).

MR. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to a question that has occurred at Wheatley, in Oxfordshire, with regard to the children being taken to church on last Ascension Day; whether it is a fact that, although the school was not opened on that day, no proper notice of a holiday was given; that after the children had assembled at the school at 9 a.m. they were at once marched to church, and that one child who attempted to go home, in accordance with his parents' wishes, was not allowed to do so; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the case.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have no information as to this case, but I will cause inquiries to be made.

Grants for Higher Education in Ireland.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have asked from the Treasury grants for the purpose of establishing higher national schools in Ireland so to enable children from the national school to graduate for the University; and what answers have the Treasury given.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Commissioners of National Education have on more than one occasion proposed the establishment of higher grade national schools; but the Treasury has not seen its way to sanctioning the expenditure involved.

County of London Pensions Committee.

MR. B. S. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in the county of London, the appointment of the pensions committee is to be made by the borough councils or the London County Council.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) As the Old-age Pensions Bill now stands the pension committee would in London be appointed by the London County Council, and not by the Metropolitan borough councils.

Irish Agricultural Holdings

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain and state, as to the end of June, 1908, the number of agricultural holdings in each county, and in the whole of Ireland, under £10 valuation, purchased without nlargement under the Land Act of 1903; their aggregate area, Poor Law valuation, and price, omitting bonus; the number of the purchasers of these uneconomic holdings in arrear in the payment of their annuities; and the aggregate area of untenanted and non-residential land in each county, and in the whole of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that upwards of 47,000 holdings purchased under the Act of 1903 have already been vested in the purchasing tenants, and that in upwards of 110,000 cases purchase agreements have been lodged, but the holdings are not yet vested in the purchasers. The cases are not classified according to Poor Law valuation, and the particulars asked for in the Question could only be obtained by an examination of each separate purchase agreement. The Estates Commissioners inform me, and indeed it is sufficiently obvious, that they could not undertake this very extensive task without totally disorganising the work of their office. I may however inform the hon. Member that particulars (including tenement valuation) of all cases in which tenant purchasers are in default in the payment of land purchase annuities are shown in the Appendix to the Annual Report of the Irish Land Commission. The area and tenement valuation of the untenanted land in each county of Ireland which is in the occupation of owners will be found in Table I. of Appendix VII. to the Third Report of the Royal Commission on Congestion.

Restoration of County Longford Evicted Tenants.

MR. J. PHILLIPS (Longford, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have succeeded in purchasing any land in the County Longford, Ireland, in order to restore the County Longford evicted tenants; if so, will he state how many acres and the name of the lands so purchased; and when will the tenants be restored.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have purchased, under the Irish Land Act, 1903, the estates of F. W. Cusack and R. O'Brien in County Longford. On the former estate 244 acres of untenanted land were acquired, and on 151 acres thereof three evicted tenants were reinstated. On the O'Brien estate 45 acres of untenanted land were acquired, on which an evicted tenant was reinstated. The Commissioners are at present negotiating for the purchase of the estate of L. J. Dopping Hepenstall, on which there are 168 acres of untenanted land, which it is proposed to give to nine evicted tenants, and for the estate of R. Davoren, on which there are 155 acres of untenanted land. The Commissioners are not at present able to say how much of this will be given to evicted tenants if they should acquire the estate. Further, the Commissioners have published in the Dublin *Gazette* a notice of their intention to acquire, under the Evicted Tenants Act, 1907, the estate of H. B. Armstrong, on which there are 117 acres of untenanted land.

Grants for Scholarships in Ireland.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education have on several occasions asked for grants to give prizes and scholarships to brilliant boys in Irish national schools, so as to graduate in a technical school or in a University; and whether the Treasury have in every case refused.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, with a view to encouraging national teachers to obtain University degrees, have asked for funds to give a special bonus to teachers who have succeeded in obtaining University degrees; and whether, seeing the importance of this matter, in view of the establishment of popular Universities in Ireland, the Treasury will consider the justice of this claim by the education authorities in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It is the fact that the Commissioners of National Education have asked for grants for the purposes mentioned in these two Questions, but the Government have not found it possible to grant their requests. I would remind the hon. Member that a considerable grant is now being made for the more pressing purpose of increasing the emoluments of the teachers generally.

Training of Irish Teachers.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether arrangements will be made to enable teachers in training to attend University lectures and graduate during their training course.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I should hope that it will be found possible to give teachers in training an opportunity of attending University lectures.

Disposal of Unallotted Portion of the Claremount Lands.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what the intentions of the Congested Districts Board are as to the disposal of the unallotted portion of the Claremount lands, Claremorris, County Mayo, at present on their hands.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Congested Districts Board intend to dispose of the unallotted portion of the Claremount estate by adding it to the small holdings on the adjacent Dale estate.

Evicted Tenants—Claim of John D. M'Auliffe.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have considered the claim of John D. M'Auliffe, an evicted tenant on the estate of Mr. Devyanes Smyth, Ballygibbon, Blarney; and, if so, whether it has been placed on the approved list of those who are to be provided with holdings under the Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative, and to the second part in the negative. The Commissioners have decided to take no action upon the application.

Grants to Irish Intermediate Education Board from Surplus Duty on Intoxicating Drinks.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the amount of the surplus duty tax on intoxicating drinks that has been available for Irish Intermediate education in each year since the amount of the Irish Intermediate grant was made dependent on the amount of intoxicating drink consumed in Ireland; and will he consider the advisability of making this grant dependent in future on some source other than the present one.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The amounts which have been paid to the Intermediate Education Board, under Section 3 (ii.) of the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, are as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
1891 - - -	39,042	6	11
1892 - - -	47,526	13	3
1893 - - -	44,164	4	11
1894 - - -	44,261	9	5
1895 - - -	40,718	15	10
1896 - - -	47,232	15	7
1897 - - -	50,841	14	0
1898 - - -	54,174	19	8
1899 - - -	57,975	7	8
1900 - - -	71,400	2	5
1901 - - -	64,730	16	2
1902 - - -	56,583	14	10
1903 - - -	59,430	14	0
1904 - - -	56,156	3	4
1905 - - -	50,385	6	10
1906 - - -	48,255	19	6
1907 - - -	49,916	17	3
1908 - - -	49,504	7	1

The hon. Member appears to assume that the amount payable to the Intermediate Education Board under this head is dependent solely upon the quantity of intoxicating drink consumed in Ireland. The amount of the Irish portion of the Customs and Excise duties grant is fixed by Statute at nine-hundredths of the total grant for the United Kingdom, and this total grant depends upon the duties paid in the United Kingdom generally. The residue of the Irish portion of the grant, after the payment of £78,000 annually to the Department of Agriculture, is payable to the Intermediate Education Board. To alter the allocation of the grant or to provide funds for Intermediate education from another source would equally require legislation, and it is by no means sure that any change which could be made would be advantageous to the funds of the Board.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Admiralty Expenditure on Coal.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can state the total amount estimated to be spent by the Admiralty during the current financial year in the purchase of coal; and what would have been the total increase of this charge on the Naval Estimates if the contract price of all coal purchased had been raised by 1s. 6d. per ton.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The reply to the first part of the Question is approximately £1,784,800. In regard to the second part of the Question, it is not considered to be in the public interests to furnish information bearing upon the consumption of coal for the Fleet.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): But why is it not in the public interest, seeing that the Admiralty always pay 1s. or 1s. 6d. per ton more than anyone else?

MR. McKENNA: It is not in the public interest to make a statement as to the amount of coal actually consumed by the Navy. I have given the cost.

Southampton County Association's Recruiting Circular.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to a poster bearing the Royal Arms, and ostensibly issued by the County of Southampton Territorial Force Association, in which Hampshire men are invited to defend their country and home and so avoid conscription; and whether he will direct that such unwarrantable expressions be not introduced into official public announcements.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Does the right hon. Gentleman consider that there is anything either unwarrantable or improper in the suggestion that the men of Hampshire should defend their homes and country?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): In reply to my hon. friend I do not see anything in the circular that is in the least degree open to exception. My sympathy is wholly with the Hampshire Association.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: Does the right hon. Gentleman give it as his opinion that that Association is entitled to use the expression "and so avoid conscription" in a public document bearing the Royal Arms?

MR. HALDANE: I do not know whether my hon. friend wishes to invite conscription. I am obliged to this Association for pointing out an additional motive for coming into the Territorial Army.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: Is that Association, as a public body, entitled to give such an expression of opinion as is embodied in the phrase "and so avoid conscription"?

MR. HALDANE: I should have thought most certainly.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): Does the right hon. Gentleman associate himself with that argument?

MR. HALDANE: Certainly; I think the Territorial Force is a considerable bulwark against conscription.

Volunteer Long-Service Medal.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY (Middlesex, Hornsey): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if a Volunteer, who has served sixteen years and does not join the Territorial Force, is eligible for the long-service medal, whereas a Volunteer who has served more than sixteen years and less than twenty years, and who joins the Territorial Force, and whose term of service in the Territorial Force, together with his term of service in the Volunteers, reaches twenty years, is not eligible for the long-service medal; and, if this is the case, what is the reason for this apparent inequality of treatment.

MR. HALDANE: As I have already explained to the House, no inequality of treatment was intended. In view, however, of the apparent dissatisfaction on this point it has been decided that Volunteers of sixteen years service who have joined the Territorial Force may have the option of being considered either for the long-service medal or the new efficiency medal.

Dockyard Territorials.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the Admiralty have declared that they have the first claim on the services of all men employed in the Royal dockyards, and that they would not permit any man belonging to the Territorial Army to leave his work on Army mobilisation unless he could be spared, he can assure the House that all dockyard men in the Territorial Force will, on an emergency, be able to perform the duties for which they are enlisted.

MR. HALDANE: I must refer the hon. Member to the Amendment to Section 1 of Clause 17 of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, moved by the Leader of the Opposition and accepted by the Government, with regard to the special arrangements to be made for individuals whose services may be required in other than a military capacity, and to the discussion on this Amendment and one moved by himself. To this I have nothing to add.

MR. ASHLEY: But may I ask what special arrangements have been made?

MR. HALDANE: Will be made?

MR. ASHLEY: No, what special arrangements have been made to deal with men employed by the Admiralty who have been allowed to join the Territorial Reserve.

MR. HALDANE: The clause says that arrangements will be made, and they will be made accordingly when the necessity arises.

MR. ASHLEY: Will the arrangement be such as to enable them to defend their country in time of danger?

MR. HALDANE: That entirely depends on the necessity of the situation.

The Territorial Force Returns.

MR. W. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the number of men that have joined under the Territorial Forces Act under the twelve months agreement, and how many, if any, have joined under the age of eighteen; and what is the total number of men and officers who have joined in the various parts of the United Kingdom up till 1st July.

MR. HALDANE: The Returns are not yet quite complete. The information at present available shows that the total number of non-commissioned officers and men who have enlisted is 173,351; details by districts will be printed in the Votes and Proceedings. The number of men who have enlisted for one year is about 113,500. The Returns do not contain information regarding the ages. The total number of officers who have joined is 8,326 (excluding veterinary officers and chaplains). Appended are the figures referred to in the foregoing Answer—

Provisional Return. Territorial Force. Strength on July 1st, 1908.
Summary. All Arms. (N.C.O.'s and Men.)

District.	Establishment.	Strength.	Percentage (nearest whole number).
No. 1 (Highland)	25,965	15,332	59
„ 2 (Lowland)	27,112	15,937	59
„ 3 (Lancashire, &c.) ...	36,712	22,341	61
„ 4 (Welsh)	27,073	16,384	61
„ 5 (Yorkshire, &c.) ...	38,116	23,522	62
„ 6 (N. Midland) ...	19,613	12,599	64
„ 7 (S. Midland) ...	20,163	13,227	66
„ 8 (S. Western) ...	26,397	14,357	54
„ 9 (Eastern)	20,879	11,774	56
„ 10 (Home Counties) ...	22,045	10,268	47
London	38,124	17,610	46
Total	302,199	173,351	57

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Can the right hon. Gentleman say how many officers short there are?

MR. HALDANE: No, Sir; but I think there is a much larger percentage of the officers than of men.

Woolwich Arsenal.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if any workmen have been discharged from Woolwich Arsenal since 1st January last, and, if so, how many; and whether any more are to be discharged during the remainder of the year.

Mr. HALDANE: Excluding boys whom it has been found impossible to engage as men on reaching the age of twenty-one, thirty men have been discharged (all at their own request) during the period 4th January, 1908, to 27th June, 1908, from the factories for which a minimum establishment was fixed. In addition, during the same period, forty-five men have been discharged, as is usual during the summer months, from the Building Works Department, for which no minimum was fixed. No men have been discharged on reduction; and it is not anticipated that any men will be so discharged during the remainder of the year from the factories for which a minimum establishment has been fixed, except at their own request, or in cases where they have completed some special work for which they were specially engaged.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): May I ask whether, when the numbers of workmen are increased, favourable consideration will be given to the claims of the men who have been discharged?

Mr. HALDANE: I should think wherever that can be done it will be done. We are very reluctant to discharge anybody, and those who are discharged will have the first chance.

Woolwich Arsenal Inquest.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the inquest held at Woolwich on the death of James Reynolds; will he say if the deceased had been a workman at Woolwich Arsenal and had been discharged; and, if so, how long he had worked at the Arsenal, when he was discharged, and for what reason.

Mr. HALDANE: My attention has been drawn to this unfortunate occurrence. The deceased workman was employed in the Royal Laboratory for twenty-two years, and was discharged with a gratuity of £27 15s. 6d. on 17th August, 1907, owing to the necessary reduction in the establishment.

Mr. FELL: Had the deceased any pension?

Mr. HALDANE: No, only a gratuity.

New Cavalry Sword.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now give any information with regard to the new pattern cavalry sword; and how soon the cavalry will be armed with it.

Mr. HALDANE: The new pattern has just been approved and manufacture will at once be proceeded with, but no statement can yet be made as to the date when the cavalry will be re-armed with the new weapon.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE: I hope they will be manufactured with all possible speed.

Supposed Foreign Spies in England.

Colonel LOCKWOOD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what steps, if any, he intends to take with regard to the facts forwarded to him on the subject of the military men from a foreign nation who have been resident for the last two years, on and off, in the neighbourhood of Epping, and who have been sketching and photographing the whole district and communicating their information directly to their own country.

Mr. HALDANE: As the law of this country stands at present, everybody, whether he is an Englishman or a foreigner, is at liberty to go about and, if he likes, to sketch and photograph, excepting in places where there are fortifications. Nor am I aware that in other civilised countries the law is materially different. And I wish to add that I neither attach as much importance as does the right hon. and gallant Member to the results, nor in this case do I feel so certain as he does about the facts.

Colonel LOCKWOOD: Surely the right hon. Gentleman is aware that in foreign countries where similar proceedings are carried on there is a very speedy method of ending them?

Mr. HALDANE: If you go near fortifications, either here or there, you will find yourself very summarily dealt with, but you may go and sketch over the whole of Germany, so far as I am aware.

Mr. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe): Is it not open to anybody to buy Stanford's 25-inch scale map, which shows the whole country, with every particular in regard to roads, elevations, etc., better than anyone could possibly sketch it?

Mr. HALDANE: Yes; and I believe on the Continent you can buy the general staff maps in addition. Very little importance is attached to that.

Mr. ASHLEY: Will not the right hon. Gentleman reconsider his action of two years ago in stopping the military reconnaissance of Great Britain, in case an invasion takes place?

Mr. HALDANE: The hon. Gentleman appears to have little confidence in the capacity of our people. The military reconnaissances were stopped because they were not suitable for the purpose for which they were intended. The most careful study of the ground will be made in the future by the forces charged with the defence of the country.

Mr. ASHLEY: Why not institute proper reconnaissances?

An HON. MEMBER asked whether this state of things was increasing in this country, and whether the same process was not going on in the New Forest and elsewhere.

Mr. HALDANE: I do not think so. I was told that a most certainly authenticated case had been discovered of three foreign officers taking observations not long ago. They were living apparently in great luxury at a house down in the country, with motors and champagne. On investigation I discovered that they were three gentlemen of a quite different character, not in the least associated with military matters, nor anything so desirable. This is the kind of thing which is constantly coming up.

Colonel LOCKWOOD: Is not the right hon. Gentleman rather turning the whole matter into ridicule? Does he approve of the system which is apparently going on in our midst?

Mr. HALDANE: My Answer is that it is not apparently going on. If foreign staffs want to obtain that kind of information they would not be so foolish as to do it in the way the right hon. and gallant Member speaks of.

War Office Coal Purchases.

Mr. BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the total amount estimated to be spent by the War Office during the current financial year in the purchase of coal; and what would have been the total increase of this charge on the Army Estimates if the contract price of all coal purchased had been raised by 1s. 6d. per ton.

Mr. HALDANE: The amount of coal estimated for consumption in the United Kingdom, including the ordnance factories, may approximately be taken at £300,000, and the total increase at 1s. 6d. a ton would have amounted to about £26,000.

The Special Reserve.

Major RENTON (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many men have been transferred from the artillery and infantry Militia to the corresponding arms of the Special Reserve; how many men have joined the artillery and infantry of the Special Reserve as recruits; and how many men who have been transferred to, or have joined, the Special Reserve, have passed, or are about to pass, to the Regular Army on completion of the prescribed period of service in the Special Reserve.

Mr. HALDANE: The Returns for 1st July have not all reached the War Office. If the hon. and gallant Member will put down his Question on Monday next, I hope to be able to give him complete figures.

Strength of Infantry of the Line.

Major RENTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to make any further reduction in the establishment or strength of the infantry of the line; and, if so, whether it is proposed that such reduction shall be effected by destroying additional units or by reducing the number of officers and men in existing units.

Mr. HALDANE: No, Sir.

Artillery Statistics.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the war strength of a battery of Royal Horse Artillery and a brigade of Royal Field Artillery, respectively; and what is the strength of the ammunition column required for the service of a battery of Royal Horse Artillery and a brigade of Royal Field Artillery in time of war

Mr. HALDANE: The figures are rather too long to be read out, and I will have them circulated with the Votes and Proceedings.

Appended are the figures referred to—

	War Establishment.			Remarks.
	Officers.	Other Ranks.	Horses.	
Battery Royal Horse Artillery (with Mounted Brigade) -	7	219	242	Including 1 Medical Officer, 1 Veterinary Officer, 1 Armament Artificer, 7 Drivers Army Service Corps and 2 Royal Army Medical Corps for water duties atattached.
Brigade Royal Field Artillery (including Ammunition Column) - - - -	25	939	959	Including 1 Medical Officer, 1 Veterinary Officer, 1 Armament Artificer, 26 Drivers Army Service Corps and 4 Royal Army Medical Corps for water duties attached.
Ammunition Column for Battery Royal Horse Artillery, with Mounted Brigade -	2	118	151	Including 7 Drivers Army Service Corps attached.
Ammunition Column for Brigade Royal Field Artillery	5	311	389	Including 9 Drivers Army Service Corps attached.

Establishment of Line Battalions.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any steps have yet been taken to effect the promised increase of the establishment of line battalions on the British establishment; what is the increased establishment proposed, and what is the additional number of rank and file which must be added to the present strength of in the Army order to raise battalions on the British establishment from their present actual strength to the contemplated increased establishment.

Mr. HALDANE: As I have already explained to the hon. Member in answer to his Question on 6th April, no steps can profitably be taken to raise the establishment of line battalions at home until the existing shortage on the present establishment has been made good.

Mr. ASHLEY: Are we to understand that when the shortage has been made good the right hon. Gentleman proposes to raise the strength?

Mr. HALDANE I will consider that when the shortage has been made good.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): What is the additional number of rank and file that would be required?

Mr. HALDANE: It varies with each individual battalion.

War Office, Salisbury Plain Estate, and Small Holdings.

Mr. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Devizes Division of Wiltshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a communication has been received from the Wilts County Council, asking whether any land on the War Office Estate in the Salisbury Plain area will be made available to meet the demand for small holdings in that district; and, if so, what answer has been sent.

Mr. HALDANE: The possibility of making certain War Department land near Bulford available for small holdings has been under consideration, and it is hoped shortly to make a definite offer to the Wiltshire County Council of an area in that district.

Public Servants and the Territorial Camps.

Mr. GIBBS (Bristol, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether copies of the circular sent round to Government offices stating the terms and conditions under which public servants will be granted leave to attend the annual training of the Territorial Army will be placed in the Vote Office.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.): Instructions on this subject have been issued to various public Departments, and I hardly see any necessity, therefore, for placing copies in the Vote Office.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE: Can individual Members see the regulations?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: Certainly.

Transvaal Gold Law.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government have received a reply to their communication to the Governor of the Transvaal on the subject of the draft Gold Law of that Colony, especially in respect of Sections 127 and 128 thereof, under which special disabilities are to be imposed upon coloured persons, including British-Indians.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Seely, Liverpool, Abercromby): The Secretary of State has not yet received a reply, but we are inquiring when the reply may be expected.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I will repeat the Question this day week.

Migration of Boers.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if any large parties of Boers are leaving the Transvaal at the present time; and, if so, where are they going and what is the reason given for their abandoning that country.

Colonel SEELY: I have seen a statement in the Press that a party of Boers proposes to emigrate to East Africa, but I have no official information on the subject.

Mr. FELL: Is it not the fact that a party are also going to the West Coast of Africa?

COLONEL SEELY: I have no official information, but I hope to have before long, and shall then be pleased to supply it to the hon. Member.

Transvaal Native Land and Tax Bills.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state whether the Transvaal Government has now placed His Majesty's Government in possession of information showing that the Native Land and Tax Bills at present before the Legislative Assembly are less harmful to the position of the natives than has been suggested; and whether His Majesty's Government will keep the House informed of any changes made in the Bills or known to be contemplated by the Transvaal Government.

COLONEL SEELY: No communication has yet been received from the Transvaal Government, but the Secretary of State has seen a letter from the Minister for Native Affairs, a copy of which I shall be glad to communicate to my right hon. friend, in which the objects of the Native Occupation of Lands Bill are enumerated. The first is to prevent the farming of natives by European landowners, a practice which has no doubt tended to become an evil and a danger. The Bill, which has been published in the Transvaal Government *Gazette* of 23rd May, and which appears to have been partly based on some of the recommendations of the South African Native Affairs Commission, raises some difficult questions and will no doubt be fully discussed and very possibly amended in the Transvaal Parliament. With regard to the Tax Bill further inquiries are being made.

The French Tariff.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information as to when the Commission engaged in considering the revision of the French tariff is likely to report; and whether it will be possible for the French Government to give effect to their recommendations by executive action in anticipation of the approval of the Chamber and Senate.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. J. A. PEASE, Essex, Saffron Walden; for Sir EDWARD GREY): The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative, but His Majesty's Embassy at Paris will, of course, keep us informed of the progress of the Committee's proceedings to the best of their power. My right hon. friend is informed that it would require Parliamentary legislation to raise or lower Customs duties. According to the latest information he has received, a very considerable time must elapse before the practical results of the inquiry now being conducted can be felt.

United States Head Tax on British Travellers.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS (Manchester, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the head tax on British travellers to the United States of America, imposed by the Immigration Act of 1903, was last year raised to $4; whether, seeing that Canadians are exempt from such tax, he can take steps, by the imposition of a reciprocal tax on passengers from the United States to our ports or otherwise, to obtain equal rights for all British subjects proceeding to the United States.

MR. J. A. PEASE: My right hon. friend is aware of the increase referred to by the hon. Member, but is unable to make any statement with regard to the imposition of a reciprocal tax on arrivals in British ports.

Unclaimed Dividends.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will arrange for the publication of a Blue-book giving the names and addresses of the original holders of unclaimed Government stock and dividends, so that the heirs may be made aware of the property to which they are entitled.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The advisability of adopting the course suggested by the hon. Member has been more than once considered, but I agree with my predecessors in thinking it undesirable. The compilation of such a Return as the hon. Member suggests, besides involving great trouble and expense, would in my opinion not only fail to serve any useful public purpose, but would encourage the submission of unfounded claims.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: How is it possible to advance a proper claim if the public has not opportunities of ascertaining what property is held? Will the right hon. Gentleman oppose a Motion for a Return with this information if moved by a private Member?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I should not like to answer before seeing the form of the Motion on the Paper.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: The money does not belong to you.

Old-Age Pensions.

Mr. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the receipt of outdoor relief after 1st January is a complete bar to an old-age pension, or is it the intention of the Government to fix an annual disqualification, as is done in the Registration of Voters Act.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Under Clause 3 (1) of the Bill, as proposed to be amended on Report, the receipt of outdoor relief, at any time between 1st January, 1908, and 31st December, 1910, will, subject to the exceptions provided for in the clause, be an absolute disqualification, unless, of course, there should in the meantime be further legislation.

Mr. MURNAGHAN: Is it not too severe a penalty to debar from pension for all future time persons who have been so unfortunate as to have to accept relief during the existing year?

*Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter of argument.

Sir JOHN RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer how far his original estimate of the cost of the Old-Age Pensions Bill is modified by the new sliding scale.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I gave it as my opinion during the debates in Committee that the total cost of the scheme with the sliding scale would amount to about £100,000 more than that of the original proposals.

Pay for Extra Police Duty.

Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether there are any members of the Metropolitan Police Force, A Division, employed in Government buildings, who performed considerable extra duty during the recent visit of the President of the French Republic to this country, and who have not yet received the two days extra pay granted to the police for this extra duty; and, if so, whether he will see that this extra remuneration is at once given to them.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): Certain police officers employed in public buildings performed extra duty on the occasion of the recent visit of the President of the French Republic. The claims of these officers are receiving consideration, and all who are entitled to it will shortly be given the two days extra pay.

Fairfield Shipbuilding Company, Govan—Employment of Young Persons.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the Home Office authorised the prosecution of the Fairfield Shipbuilding and Engineering Company, Govan, for illegally employing young persons after seven o'clock in the evening on two occasions, and that the sheriff took the view that a trade dispute created conditions under which it was unreasonable that employers should adhere strictly to the law and imposed a nominal fine; and whether he proposes to take any further action in this matter.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir, I am aware of the proceedings in this case, which were undertaken by my Department. As regards the second paragraph of the Question, I have communictaed with the Sheriff-Substitute, who informs me that he did not say, and does not think, that a trade dispute creates conditions under which it is unreasonable that employers should adhere strictly to the law. The assistant-manager of the Fairfield Company stated that in the confusion and dislocation of work caused by a recent strike the young persons had been employed illegally, but not by his sanction, or to his knowledge. He expressed the great regret ot his company for this occurrence, and undertook that special vigilance should be used to prevent its repetition. In these circumstances, the Sheriff-Substitute thought a nominal fine, coupled with the expenses of the prosecution, would meet the case. This firm has borne an excellent character in the past, and the occasion in question was the first, I believe, on which they have been prosecuted. I see no ground for questioning the propriety of the Sheriff-Substitute's decision.

Bishop of London's Midnight March.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will give a summary of the Police Report on the Bishop of London's midnight procession in Westminster on the night of 4th April last; will he say whether it is a fact within the knowledge of the superintendent of police and the police officers who accompanied that procession that the spiritual Lord referred to came face to face with from 150 to 200 drunken men on that occasion, and whether he took a number of drunken men out of the public-houses; and, if so, whether he will state the number and what punishment was meted out to them, and the names of the public-houses whence these drunkards were taken by the right rev. Prelate.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have nothing to add to the reply given to a Question on this subject on Thursday last; the police who were present report that they saw no drunken persons.

MR. H. C. LEA asked whether, in the absence of a report from the police on the subject, the House was to assume the Bishop of London told the truth or a falsehood.

MR. GLADSTONE replied that he had the fullest confidence that the Bishop of London made a perfectly *bona fide* statement.

MR. H. C. LEA: Does not the right hon. Gentleman consider that the police have been sadly lacking their in duty in not having reported on the matter?

MR. GLADSTONE: They reported to me when I asked for information.

MR. H. C. LEA: Is it not the fact that accompanying the procession were an inspector and several constables, and if the Bishop of London had gone into various public-houses on the line of route and dragged out those drunken men, ought not a report to have been made by the inspector in charge to Scotland Yard?

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): Is it not the fact that the statement of the Bishop of London was corroborated by independent witnesses who were present, including one magistrate?

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is it not probably a question of the standard of drunkenness?

MR GLADSTONE: I can add nothing to what I have already said. I have no doubt of the *bona fides* of the statement of the Bishop of London. But I am not responsible for what he said, and perhaps the hon. Gentleman would communicate with the Bishop himself.

MR. H. C. LEA: The right hon. Gentleman disclaims any responsibility for the Bishop of London's statement; but is he not responsible for the conduct of the police, and can he explain why they have not reported the grave departure from the public peace of which the Bishop of London complained?

MR. GLADSTONE: I have not the slightest reason to be dissatisfied with the conduct of the police in the matter.

Prison Treatment of Suffragists.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is the practice in Ireland to treat political prisoners as first-class misdemeanants; and if he will give instructions that the suffragists sentenced in London on Wednesday last be accorded like consideration.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am informed that in Ireland where prisoners are imprisoned for offences against the ordinary law which were committed in the course of a political campaign, no special treatment is accorded them on that ground. I cannot grant any special treatment to the ladies committed for refusing to find sureties.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in the case of prisoners sentenced by police magistrates, he is empowered to order that they should be treated as first-class misdemeanants; whether he or his predecessors have exercised that power within recent years; and, if so, in what cases and on what grounds.

Mr. GLADSTONE: In the case of a person committed to prison in default of finding sureties I am advised that I have no executive power to make such an order. The division in which a prisoner shall be placed must by law be determined by the magistrate in his discretion. As regards convicted prisoners also, the Home Secretary has no executive power to alter the division in which these prisoners have been placed by the Court. In two cases which occurred prior to the Prison Act of 1898 the treatment of prisoners convicted on indictment was, for special reasons, varied by means of the grant of a conditional pardon from the Crown; but I should be acting unconstitutionally if I advised his Majesty to exercise this power in such a way as to over-ride, with regard to any class of prisoners, the discretion now given by the law to the magistrates.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman state how it came to pass that Dr. Jameson and the other leaders were treated as first-class misdemeanants, after having been convicted of a most serious offence; and seeing that they were so treated, surely these ladies might be treated in the same way?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I have already stated that Dr. Jameson was a convicted prisoner before the passing of the Act of 1898, which directly put the responsibility of deciding in which division a prisoner should be placed upon the magistrate.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): But the Act of 1898 did not in the slightest degree arrogate the power of the Home Office to advise the Crown to mitigate any sentence whatever.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I hold that it would be perfectly unconstitutional on my part, if I suggested the exercise of the Crown's prerogative in order to over-ride the decision the responsibility for which under the law rests with the magistrate.

Mr. MORRELL (Oxford, Henley): But cannot the right hon. Gentleman make representations to the magistrate?

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Can the right hon. Gentleman tell the House if in any of the numerous cases in Ireland under the Statute of Edw. III. a single person convicted was treated otherwise than as an ordinary prisoner.

Mr. GLADSTONE: That Question should be addressed to the Chief Secretary.

Taxicab Speed.

Mr. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the speed at which taxicabs are driven on the streets of London, with consequent danger to other traffic, especially in residential squares, where approaching carriages and cars on cross-roads are obscured by trees; and if he will take steps to check this practice.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Both from correspondence and from personal observation

I am satisfied that some of these cabs are driven in a reckless and dangerous manner, though I am told that they seldom exceed the speed limit of twenty miles an hour. The police do their best to stop such driving, and though it is often difficult to obtain the necessary evidence, they have successfully prosecuted sixty motor cab drivers in the last twelve months.

Lights on Vehicles.

MR. JOYNSON-HICKS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received a copy of any order recently made by the Lancashire County Council, exempting from the provisions of the Lights on Vehicles Act, 1907, all harvesting vehicles during the months of June, July, August, September, and October; and whether, in view of the danger caused by this unlighted traffic to users of the roads he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir, I have received a copy of an order made by the Lancashire County Council in February last, to the effect stated in the Question. The order was made in pursuance of the power conferred on county councils by Section 4 of the Lights on Vehicles Act, and is not subject to my approval. I have no power to take any action in the matter. I may add that the Bill as introduced, contained no exception for harvesting vehicles, and that the exception was agreed to by the House of Commons on the Report Stage.

The London Police Commission.

MR. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the Report of the Police Commission, in which it is stated that Eva D'Angely was guilty of solicitation for the purpose of prostitution on 24th April, 1906, and that her arrest by Police-Constable Page was justified, and that the conduct of Police-Constable Page and of the other officers and constables concerned in the matter was discreet and correct; whether he is aware that in May, 1906, the conduct of Police-Constable Page, and the other officers and constables connected with the arrest, was severely censured in the Press, and by persons having incomplete information, that the officers and constables were unable to defend themselves against such unjust censure, and consequently suffered in character and reputation; can he state whether any of the newspapers or persons who inflicted injury upon these officers and constables who were performing a difficult duty correctly and with discretion, have offered them any reparation or apology; and, if not, will he consider whether he will take steps to obtain reparation and apology on their behalf.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir, the facts are as stated. But the confidence of their superior officers at a time of considerable difficulty was never for one moment withdrawn from Police Constable Page and the other constables concerned. As regards the latter part of the Question, I should like to say that, however unjust were the charges against these officers, their fullest satisfaction must be in the complete vindication of their action and in the splendid tribute paid to the conduct, discipline, and efficiency of the Metropolitan Police Force generally in the careful and decisive Report of the Royal Commission.

MR. A. DEWAR: Is it not a fact that those constables were prohibited by the Regulations from defending themselves two years ago, and that they cannot, as advised, raise an action for damages for defamation without the consent of their superior officer? If they are advised to raise an action will the right hon. Gentleman see that consent is given?

MR. GLADSTONE: Of course, it was in the power of the constables themselves to take action two years ago, but they did not take action because of the appointment of the Royal Commission. It was thought right that any proceedings should be deferred until the Report of the Commission was received. It is now a question for the consideration of the police whether any action shall be taken.

MR. A. DEWAR: I should like to ask whether the measure of damage cannot be estimated in pounds shillings and pence? Have they not received complete exoneration from the moral aspect, but is there not a financial aspect which still remains?

Mr. GLADSTONE: That would be a matter for the Courts.

Mr. A. DEWAR: But will they get the right hon. Gentleman's consent to raise an action if so advised?

Mr. GLADSTONE: I should prefer not to give an Answer at the present moment.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: Has the right hon. Gentleman yet received any apology at the Home Office to tender to the constables for Questions asked in this House by three hon. Gentlemen, the hon. Members for Blackpool, East Marylebone, and Chorley—in which, day after day, the most shocking imputations were made against these constables?

Mr. GLADSTONE: As far as I know, nothing has been said or done by the hon. Members in question.

Price of Bread in Germany.

Mr. GOULDING (Worcester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what steps he has taken to correct the error on page XXXVII, of the Report on Cost of Living in German Towns, whereby the price of bread in Germany is made to appear four times its actual price.

The Earl of RONALDSHAY: At the same time may I ask the President of the Board of Trade if the price of rye bread in Germany varied from 5¼d. to 7½d. per pound, as stated in the recently published Report by the Board of Trade [Cd. 4032]; and, if this is so, will he state whether the price of the 4 lbs. loaf in Germany varies from 1s. 9d. to 2s. 6d.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Churchill, Dundee): I would refer the hon. Gentleman and the noble Lord, who has put down a Question on the same subject, to my Answer to the hon. Member for Mid. Armagh on Wednesday last.

Railway Companies and Cyclists.

Mr. THORNE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received an application from the National Clarion Cycling Club for representation at the Railway Conference to endeavour to arrive at a general agreement with regard to modifications of the existing law and relations between railway companies and the general public as far as cyclists are concerned; and whether he can now undertake that, at some time before the close of the Conference, the request shall be granted.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. With regard to the second part I am afraid I can add nothing to the replies which I have previously given my hon. friend on the subject. The Board of Trade are at all times ready to receive and consider any information or arguments which may be laid before them with regard to this or similar grievances, but it will hardly be possible for the Railway Conference to go into questions of the rates and conditions for carrying particular articles.

British and German Savings.

The Earl of RONALDSHAY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what was the amount of savings in the Savings Banks of Great Britain and of Germany in 1907; and what has been the increase per cent, in each case during the past ten years.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I understand on inquiry that no official figures are available with regard to the amount deposited in Savings Banks in the German Empire, as a whole, for any later period than the end of 1904 or any earlier period than the end of 1900. I regret, therefore, that I am unable to give the information which the noble Lord desires.

Daylight Saving Bill.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the issue of the Report of the Select Committee on the Daylight Saving Bill; and, if so, whether the Department have expressed any opinion relative thereto.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have read the Report of this Committee with much interest and with a lively recognition of the advantages which the Bill in question appears at first sight to offer to all classes, and especially to the working classes. I have arranged for the whole subject to be carefully examined by the Board of Trade in consultation with representatives of trade, labour, and transport interests. Pending the result of this examination it is not possible for me to express an opinion.

Report on Wages and Prices in Germany.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if the Report by the Board of Trade on the question of wages and prices in Germany has been withdrawn; and whether such withdrawal is for correction only or is final.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Report in question has not been withdrawn, and is now on sale. A page containing a clerical error obviously inconsistent with the text has been corrected.

MR. JAMES HOPE: Will similar information be obtained regarding Belgium?

MR. CHURCHILL said a similar inquiry was in contemplation, and would, he hoped, be shortly begun in connection with the United States. No doubt such an inquiry in relation to Belgium would be interesting, but these inquiries were expensive, and the Board of Trade must be careful not to embark upon them too lightly.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade by whose authority and at whose instance the Report on prices and wages in Germany was prepared; what is the approximate cost of this Report, and out of what Vote will it be paid; and if the instructions to the persons who made the inquiries will be laid upon the Table.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Report in Question was prepared by the authority and at the instance of the President of the Board of Trade. The cost of printing is borne by the Stationery Office Vote, and amounts to about £400. The cost of making the inquiry in Germany is borne by the Board of Trade Vote, and, amounted to about £4,000. The instructions given by the Board of Trade are not embodied in any single document, but the methods adopted in the inquiry are clearly indicated in the volume, especially on page V. of the Prefatory Note and pages XI., XII., XIII., XVIII., XXIX., XXX. and XXXVII. of the General Report.

MR. FELL: Can corrected copies of the Report now be purchased? And how will further mistakes if discovered be dealt with?

MR. CHURCHILL: All documents emanating from Government Offices are very carefully prepared, but sometimes a misprint escapes attention.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): In what form has the correction been made? I understood it had been inserted in the Blue-Book.

MR. CHURCHILL: A part of the issue had already gone out when the mistake was discovered. I assume the right hon. Gentleman does not suggest it was an intentional mistake, because that would be a slur on the permanent official.

MR. LYTTELTON: Oh, no.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am glad to hear that. The issue was stopped immediately the error was discovered to enable a new page to be substituted for the incorrect one.

Unemployed Act, 1905.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether in dealing with the question of the unemployed in the coming autumn and winter, he will, in addition to renewing the Act of 1905, issue an order giving greater elasticity of administration, so as to cover a larger number of deserving cases, and more effectually to meet the varying requirements of different districts and populations. I wish to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on recovering his health.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I do not think that I could promise to issue any Order on this subject, and indeed I am not sure precisely what alteration in the existing Regulations my hon. friend desires. But if he will inform me precisely what his suggestions are I will give consideration to them.

Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill.

MR. MORRELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state when it is hoped to begin the Committee stage of the Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I hope to be able to commence the Committee stage next week.

Telephone Mouthpieces.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he is now in a position to say why the telephone companies should not be called upon to permit the adoption of the flat mouthpiece such as is allowed abroad, instead of the present retrograde and antiquated instrument, in the interests of hygiene and cleanliness.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I have no power to call upon the National Telephone Company to adopt any particular form of telephone. The standard patterns now in use are, however, those which are considered most efficient by experts both in this country and in the United States, and it is easy for any subscriber to keep his telephone in a clean and sanitary condition. I am not sure which particular pattern the hon. Member has in view, but if he will give me information with regard to it, I will have it examined.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON produced a telephone transmitter and asked the Postmaster-General to have it examined carefully.

Medical Inspection of Children.

MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the failure of certain local education committees to carry out their statutory duties of providing for the medical inspection of school children and to the inadequate salaries which some local education authorities propose to pay for this important duty; whether he proposes to take steps to ascertain the manner in which these duties are about to be performed, and, if so, when these steps will be taken; and whether he proposes to inform the various local education authorities of any measures contemplated to compel them to undertake and carry out the duties which Parliament has cast upon them.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): Yes, Sir, my attention has been drawn to certain cases where the local education authority have resolved to take no action under Section 13 of the Act, or have postponed indefinitely the consideration of the question. Steps are being taken, both by correspondence and by local investigation, to ascertain the manner in which arrangements for medical inspection are being initiated, and a clause has been inserted into the Code requiring, as a condition of the payment of the annual grant in respect of any school, that satisfactory provision should be made for the medical inspection of the children attending the school. Failure on the part of the local authority to comply with the requirements of the Act may, therefore, in addition to, and not in substitution of, other statutory remedies, result in the refusal of or deduction from the grant. Special attention has been called to this matter in the prefatory memorandum to the Code, and I think the publicity attaching to the Code will suffice to apprise the authorities of its requirements. The Board have no control over the salaries payable by local authorities to the officers engaged in medical inspection, except in so far as inadequate remuneration may be found to result in the efficiency of inspection; and until the various schemes are in working order and the Board have had opportunities of comparing the methods and efficiency of medical inspection in the various areas, I should not be prepared to say whether any particular salaries can be regarded as insufficient.

MR. H. J. TENNANT: Can any steps be taken to secure that schemes are brought up by the local authorities?

MR. RUNCIMAN: Some steps must of necessity wait until the schemes are brought forward, but if it is found that a local authority absolutely refuses to take action in respect of the medical inspection of children we shall make the necessary deduction from their grant.

MR. H. GOOCH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the provision, prescribed in Article 58 (*b*) of the Code for 1908–9 for the medical inspection of all children admitted to an elementary school on and after 1st August, 1908, and of all children expected to leave school before 31st July, 1909, necessarily includes all or any of the requirements specified in the Board of Education's Circular 576, page 8, Section 11; whether it is necessary that all the above examinations should be conducted by a qualified medical practitioner; and, if the Answer be in the negative, which of the above examinations may be conducted by: (*a*) teacher; (*b*) a qualified nurse; whether the use of the schedule in the Board of Education's Circular No. 582, pp. 4 and 5, is obligatory, and whether it must be filled up in every particular.

MR. RUNCIMAN: As I recently stated to a deputation, of which the hon. Member formed a part, inquiries as to the methods or machinery of medical inspection should obviously be addressed to the Board in writing and if made will receive prompt attention and, as far as possible, full replies. It is impossible to deal satisfactorily or completely with matters of detail within the limits of an Answer across the floor of the House, and I think I should be exposing both the Board and local authorities to risk of misunderstanding if I attempted to do so. If the hon. Member communicates with the Board on behalf of a local authority, I shall be glad to see that he has a written reply without delay.

School Object Lessons.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that the children attending St. Bride's School, near Newport, Monmouthshire, were recently granted a holiday by the headmistress in order that they might attend an otter hunt as an object lesson; whether the object lesson was to teach the children the duty of kindness to animals; and whether such object lessons meet with the approval and sanction of the Board.

*SIR IVOR HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.) asked the right hon. Gentleman before he answered the Question, to give due consideration to the fact that the people of Monmouthshire, and the people of Wales generally, combine a great zeal for education with an irrepressible love of hunting.

MR. REES: Does the Board of Education propose to pronounce an opinion on the ethics of otter hunting or any other form of sport?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I have received no information as to the incident referred to. I understand, however, from my hon. friend's Question that the school was closed and the children were given a holiday, in which case I have no power to intervene. It is within the discretion of the local education authority to direct or permit the closure of the public elementary schools in their area on such occasions as they think fit, provided they are open a sufficient number of times to satisfy the requirements of the Code. I need hardly say that the Board do not regard otter hunting as an object lesson.

Hyde Park Carriage Entrances.

MR. H. GOOCH: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether his attention has been called to the fact that the south side of Hyde Park contains five gates for carriage traffic, while the north side contains only two; and whether he could arrange that the gate on the north side at the south end of Albion Street, Paddington, should be made available for carriage traffic.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. L. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): I regret that there are no funds available for such a purpose.

I shall be prepared to consider the question when the Estimates for next year are under consideration; but I cannot give any pledge in the matter, as the initial and annual expense would be considerable.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of a charge of this kind being borne by the people who avail themselves of the improvement and not by the general public?

Mr. HARCOURT: I think that would be worth consideration.

Girl Clerks in the Post Office.

Sir G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that girl clerks in the Post Office are now to be paid at the rate of £42, rising by £3 increments to £48 per annum, and are after two years service promoted to permanent women-clerkships, while boy clerks employed in the Post Office and other Civil Service Departments, who do similar work, are paid at the rate of £39, rising by increments of £2 12s., and have no such prospects of promotion open to them; and can he say what is the reason why such distinctions, as regards salaries, increments, and promotion are made between boys and girls who perform similar duties in the public service.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: My attention has been drawn to the scale of pay for girl clerks quoted by my hon. friend. The conditions of service of boy clerks will probably be altered very shortly, and I do not, therefore, propose at the present juncture taking action on the lines suggested by the Question.

Boy Clerks in the Civil Service.

Mr. P. W. WILSON (St. Pancras, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can now give any particulars of the proposals of the Treasury with regard to the employment of boy clerks in the Civil Service; and whether he will undertake that in future no appointments of boy clerks will be made in excess of the number which can be absorbed into the permanent establishment of the Civil Service.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: It is intended that in future the boy clerks should enter between the ages of fifteen and sixteen, and that they should be discharged on attaining the age of eighteen unless they have been successful in the competition for assistant clerkships, the limits of age for which will in future be seventeen to eighteen instead of nineteen to twenty-one. I cannot undertake that the number of boy clerks employed will not exceed the number for which permanent appointments can be found, though I am making inquiries as to the probable results of the new terms, on the percentage of appointments; but as those unsuccessful in the competitions will not be retained as boy clerks after the age of eighteen they will be in a better position than at present to obtain subsequent employment.

Public Trustee and Stockbrokers' Commission.

Mr. RIDSDALE (Brighton): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether it is the practice of the Public Trustee to endeavour to arrange with stockbrokers for the return of half the commission charged by them on transactions for estates under his control; and whether any moneys so obtained are placed to the credit of the respective estates concerned, or, if not, what becomes of them.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. Robson, South Shields): There is a distinction made between cases of sale and those of purchases made for investment. The Public Trustee is authorised by the Treasury under the Statutory rules to make a charge of ½ per cent. for the trouble and responsibility involved in making an investment, and out of this he pays the stockbroker. This office, therefore, gets the benefit of any commission returned. In the case of sales, the Public Trustee charges no fee. The broker is paid out of the Trust Estate, and consequently that estate gets any commission returned. In the case of a sale for the purpose of making a new investment, when done in one Stock

Exchange Account, the ½ per cent. investment fee covers the brokerage on both transactions, and consequently any commission returned is retained by the Trustee.

Mr. RIDSDALE asked whether this somewhat complicated arrangement was made public by the Official Trustee.

Sir W. ROBSON: It is made public. The Public Trustee is authorised to make this charge of 10s. per cent. but it is not stated that out of that 10s. he pays the broker.

The South Western District Coroner.

Major RENTON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether the attention of the Lord Chancellor has been drawn to the practices of the coroner of the South Western District, and to allegations concerning them; and whether the Lord Chancellor proposes to take any steps in this connection.

Sir W. ROBSON replied that the attention of his noble friend had been previously called to this matter, and all that could be said at present was that it was under his consideration.

Clyde Pilots Grievance.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been drawn to a trial at Glasgow on 15th May last, before the sheriff of the county of Lanark, in which a Clyde pilot was charged under the Merchant Shipping Acts and convicted of negligently navigating a ship he was piloting so as to cause an alleged risk of collision with H.M.S. "Harrier" and danger to the lives of those on board the vessels; whether he will take into consideration the exceptional circumstances (in particular that, although this matter involved the exercise of the best practical seamanship in its decision, it was decided by the sheriff, who did not possess any nautical knowledge whatever and was without assistance from anyone who had such knowledge, and that before the trial the pilot had been examined as to the occurrence by the Clyde Pilotage Board, by whom he was licensed, and had been exonerated from all blame in the matter); and whether he will, in view of the circumstances of the case and of the fact that the Criminal Appeal Act does not extend to Scotland, take steps to secure a reconsideration of the case, with the assistance of nautical assessors.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire): My attention has been drawn to the matter referred to by my hon. friend and it has received my best consideration. I am advised that a re-hearing of the case is not legally competent, and as to reduction of penalty I do not see my way to interfere.

Mr. JOYCE: Is the meaning of that Answer that a man can be tried under the law of the country by an incompetent authority and be refused a fair trial by a competent authority if he asks for it?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not accept that description.

Mr. JOYCE: I hope my friends the pilots will take cognisance of this and press the matter further.

Trawling in Moray Firth.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland what length of time has elapsed since communication was first entered into by his office with the Board of Agriculture with a view of advising the Foreign Office in its negotiations with the North Sea Powers for closing the Moray Firth against trawlers.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Negotiations have for some time been in active progress on this matter. The first statement that I made on the subject was in the month of March, and I hope my hon. friend will accept my assurance that no time has been lost.

Irish Banknotes.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in reference to the changing of an Irish bank note in Great Britain on payment of a commission of 1d. in the £, whether the inter-bank arrangement of charging commission is laid down by the Bank of England; if not, under what statutory enactment is the charge made; and does the inter-bank arrangement or the statutory enactment apply in the case of an Irish bank making payment of its own notes in one of its branches in London.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The Bank of England has no power to lay down any arrangement for other banks on this subject and no such arrangement has been voluntarily agreed to by other banks at their suggestion. Perhaps I may remind the hon. Member that an Irish bank note is an engagement by an Irish bank to pay a sum of money on demand at a certain place or places in Ireland. The bank which issues the note cannot be compelled to pay it in London; nor can any other bank in London be required to do so. If London banks are willing to cash such notes on payment of a commission, no statutory enactment is necessary to enable the commission to be charged.

MR. FLYNN: Then do I understand that if an Irish bank with a branch in London desires to give cash for its own notes it can do so without interference from the Bank of England?

MR. HOBHOUSE: Certainly, so far as I know.

Board of Trade Vote.

MR. GOULDING (Worcester): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in allotting the Committee of Supply, he will arrange for the Board of Trade Vote, in order that attention may be called to the divergent statements regarding the cost of living in Germany contained in the Report of the Board of Trade just issued compared with the Reports of the British consuls in Germany.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The Board of Trade do not admit that there is any such divergence as is suggested in the Question. I am sure that they will be ready to consider any statements which the hon. Member or others may submit to them.

MR. GOULDING: Will the right hon. Gentleman in allocating days to Supply set one apart for this Vote especially in view of the depression of trade in this country?

MR. ASQUITH: I cannot yet say what Votes will be taken.

Royal Commission on the Poor Law.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to its bearing upon the questions of the aged poor and of the unemployed, he will represent to the Chairman of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law the urgent importance of the Report being laid before Parliament this year.

MR. ASQUITH: My right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board stated on 20th May that the Royal Commission were not without hope that they might be able to present their Report in the autumn, but that it was impossible to give a precise date by which it would be issued. I cannot at present add anything to that.

The Unemployed Grant.

SIR JOHN RANDLES: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can arrange that his announcement as to money grants for the unemployed shall be made prior to the discussion of the Vote for the Local Government Board.

MR. ASQUITH: I am not prepared at present to make any statement on this matter.

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Reported, with an Amendment, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 212.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 212.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 294.]

HOP INDUSTRY.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 213.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.)

Ordered, That the proceedings on the Old-Age Pensions Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House).—(*Mr. Asquith.*)

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) (No. 2) BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [22nd June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Mr. James Mason*).

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said that the supporters of the Bill, when discussing its merits in the country, had recently been very forward with charges of inhumanity against those who were opposing it, and they on that side of the House did propose not to allow such a charge to go forth without first instituting an inquiry into the history of the measure during the last fifteen years. He thought that would be a convenient opportunity for such an inquiry. Historically, the case put forward by the miners' representatives was first advanced from the point of view of the limitation of output, the idea being that by so limiting it they might succeed in raising wages. If they turned to the reports of earlier meetings at which the question was discussed by the representatives of the men, and looked also at the reports of the earlier debates in that House they would find that that point of view was emphasised. It was not without interest to remember in the same connection the finding of the Home Office Committee recalling a very familiar fact to those who had studied the question, that—

> "By combination the workers have secured a direct relation between the price of coal and their wages."

Fortunately they were not left to unassisted conjecture as to the object of the miners' representatives in that House, because many of them had already published their views upon the subject and they were on record for anybody to read. He was interested in what had fallen from the hon. Member for North East Derbyshire who, in April last, speaking at Cresswell, made the following observations which threw no small light upon the secret history of the movement—

> "With regard to the Eight Hours Bill, it would be the salvation of the coal trade of the country, and if it did not pass wages would very soon fall."

Clearly that was the object with which the agitation was commenced. But then, finding that the consumers of the country were very dissatisfied with that point of view, and that it became increasingly unpopular in the constituencies, hon. Gentlemen advanced it less conspicuously and fell back on the contention that in the interests of the unemployed it was desirable to limit the output. The hon. Member for North-East Manchester, when introducing his universal Eight Hours Bill earlier in the session, said there were trades in which hundreds of thousands were employed, the regulation of whose hours of labour would provide openings for the class of men who were now shut out from an opportunity of work altogether. But the economics of both those proposals having become the subject of general derision among those who were in any way qualified to speak upon the question, it became necessary for the miners' representatives in the House to fall back on a totally different contention, and, in despair, they began to ingeminate a cry of humanity. In connection with this historical *resume* fortunately he had not to ask the House to depend merely on his own accuracy. He commended to the indulgence of the House the remarks of a far higher authority, those of the hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division, who, speaking on the Eight Hours Bill, in 1901, said—

> "My hon. friend has said it is not the object of this measure to limit the output of coal, but

this was really the object with which the agitation began. At the Bradford Trade Union Congress in 1888 it was distinctly stated that it was to restrict the output of coal, which was about 20,000,000 tons more than was necessary, but when it was found that the British consumer would have something to say to any limitation of the output, then the promoters took another line, and said that if the hours of labour were reduced employment would be found for a greater number. When the weakness of that was pointed out, the promoters fell back on a third line, that the Bill would increase the safety of the miners.' "

There was one further observation of a prefatory character he made about the position which the Labour Party and the miners' representatives in the House had taken up in regard to the eight hours question. From the beginning to the end their attitude from the economic point of view, and indeed their competence to understand the elements of the problem had been absolutely discredited by the Report of the Committee recently appointed by the Home Secretary. The Chairman of that Committee made some observations to the House during the earlier portion of that debate, when he said—

> "An eight hours law such as that which would have been enacted by the Eight Hours Bills which have formerly been submitted to the House would have produced a shortage of coal which would have caused insufferable public inconvenience and possibly disastrous consequences to the trade of the country."

That was the Bill which hon. Members below the gangway and miners' representatives in the House had been insistently and vehemently pressing on the attention of the country and Parliament for the last twenty years, and they now had the authority of a Committee to the effect that if those proposals had been carried into law the result would have been insufferable public inconvenience, and possibly disaster to the trade of the country. In addition to that the Labour Party had not found it convenient to go before the Committee and give evidence in support of their views. They had found it easier to make rhetorical appeals to sentiment in the House, than to present reasoned arguments and undergo cross examination before a competent tribunal. The only pretext put forward on behalf of the Labour Party for not doing what other parties had been content to do throughout our long Parliamentary history was that there had already been enough discussion of the measure and that more consideration of it was unnecessary. It might, perhaps, be a sufficient answer to that objection to quote a statement made by the Home Secretary in a recent debate to the effect that—

> "Ever since 1890 the economic side of the question has never been considered by any neutral authority."

They were told by the representatives of the miners that miners throughout the country all wanted the Bill, and one hon. Gentleman, representing, he believed, a Welsh constituency, in the course of the debate the other night, said that that was a sufficient reason for passing it. He could not admit that premiss, and he would dispute still more warmly the conclusion; and on this point he would like to quote the finding of the Committee to the effect that—

> "It is quite conceivable that a situation might be created by an enhanced price of coal under eight hours in which the economic interests of the men might be opposed to the economic interests of the country."

When they were told that the miners of the country were in favour of it, it became extremely important to ask what it was of which they were in favour, and upon what proposition it was there had been that expression of unanimity on which so much reliance was placed. He invited the attention of the House to a somewhat instructive lesson as to the view of the men. Those who spoke for them in that House commonly said that by working harder, by having fewer holidays, and by taking fewer short days, production would not be appreciably reduced. That was the argument laid before the House and judiciously combined with the humanitarian argument. But the argument used before the men was of a totally different character. The question they were asked and which they had answered was as far apart as the Poles from the House of Commons contention. Here again he asked the House to accept not his evidence but that of a conspicuous advocate of the Eight Hours' Bill. Briefly summarised, the question put to the men was: "Are you in favour of obtaining the same wages for shorter hours of work?" That was the only question the hon. Member asked the miners, and was it surprising that whenever and wherever it had been asked of the men it has been answered affirmatively? The hon. Member for the Ince Division put this question before his constituents. Speaking on 12th April, he said—

> "The actual hewing price paid in forty-eight pits in South-West Lancashire was 2s. 9d. per ton. If the Bill became law, the hours worked would be reduced by one-eighth or one-ninth, and they would have to put one-eighth on the hewing price. They would get such an amount per ton as would compensate the men for the limitation of hours. One-eighth upon 2s. 9d. gave them about 4d. per ton, and adding 2d. more for other labour affected, 6d. per ton would completely clear all the increased cost to employers."

Was it astonishing that at the conclusion of such a speech they should get an unanimous vote in favour of the Bill now before the House? Was it surprising that manual labourers should answer "yes" when asked whether they were in favour of working fewer hours for the same wages? The admission made by the hon. Gentleman that the increased price would be 6d. was not without interest, because clearly no allowance was made for the increase of price on account of plant and machinery turning out less coal. He did not think it would be seriously disputed that it was an under estimate. On that point they had the finding of the Committee which had not been challenged and which the Home Secretary had in fact accepted. Would the representatives of the miners deal with that point, not so much from a rhetorical as from an argumentative point of view? The Committee had found that the adoption of the eight hours day, whether sudden or gradual, would result in a period of embarrassment and loss to the country at large. It would reduce the average working hours by 10·27 per cent., and increase the cost by from 1s. 6d. to 2s. per ton. It was extremely important that the Committee should recollect in this connection that that variation by no means represented the variation which would follow in the market price. Certain qualifications were put forward by the Committee which, to some extent, it was suggested would affect the figure put forward by the witness called on behalf of the mine-owners. The first modification suggested was the probable effect of new plant and machinery to be introduced by the mine-owners. Was it contemplated that the new plant and machinery was to be introduced upon commercial principles or not? Was it suggested that that new plant and machinery would pay or would it not pay? If it was considered that it would pay he suggested to the Home Secretary that the mine-owners of the country, who had had generations of experience and who had devoted their minds to the problem of how to make the largest profit that could be made, were better judges whether or not new plant or machinery could be introduced with success than a number of Socialist amateurs, who had never had any responsibility at all for the conduct of mines, or any experience of the standing charges, of the economic consequences of excessive capital outlay. If they were not to pay what inference was to be drawn? If new machinery and plant were to be introduced which would not pay, obviously the price of coal would have to be raised so as to cover the loss on that plant and machinery. It was suggested as a second qualification that if this Eight Hours Bill was introduced the men would work very much harder, that their productivity during the limited period would be greater than during the longer hours. Fortunately, he could give an authority upon this point who was entitled to speak with weight. He referred to the hon. Member for the Wansbeck division of Northumberland. The hon. Member contemplated that very argument that productivity would increase if the number of hours were reduced. Speaking in that House in 1901 he said—

> "They intend to keep up the production of coal by increasing the intensity of labour; but is the rush and the hurry thus created not likely to increase the risk of the miner? The increased intensity of labour is the very thing which causes a number of the accidents that do happen."

If to that observation, put forward with very great weight by the hon. Member for the Wansbeck division, was added the argument so obvious in the case of old men, it must be conceded that the intensity of labour was likely to produce more accidents, and, therefore, too much importance or effect could not be given to the second qualification. The third suggestion was that the men would work on double shifts. He invited the Labour

Party specifically to enlighten the House as to their attitude with regard to a double shift. Was their view that the men were prepared to agree to a double shift in order to lessen the shortage of production which would be caused by this Act? Up to the present no answer had been given to that question at all. Fortunately, the House was not left without evidence on that point because the South Wales Miners Federation published a list of their objects and this was one of them—

> "To endeavour to secure by legislation a reduction of the hours of labour in mines to eight hours from bank to bank, and oppose the system of double shifts."

It would be very interesting to discover from the Home Secretary, or from those responsible for the very able Report of the Committee in view of the shortage which would otherwise be produced, whether they had taken into consideration the fact that up to the present no responsible representatives of the miners in that House had ever said that they would consent to the system of double shifts. If those three qualifications had no real value they were left face to face with the reduction stated by the Committee and assented to by the Home Secretary; that was to say, the loss of production would be 25,783,000 tons calculated on the output of 1906 and the reduction in the hours of all classes underground will be 10·27 per cent. The question which he ventured to ask was why were his constituents to pay a greatly increased price for their coal—and many of his constituents themselves worked ten, twelve, and even fourteen hours a day—[Cries of "Shame."]—it might be a shame but he was dealing with facts. As he had stated many of his own constituents worked ten, twelve, or even fourteen hours a day, and would anyone inform the House why people in that position, with the slenderest possible margin left after making provision for the necessities of life, should pay a higher price for their coal in order to allow a class, who were admittedly remunerated above, and more healthy than any other class of manual labour, to have an eight hours working day. He noticed that a Member of the Labour Party who was going to vote for this Bill made a speech at the Church Congress in which he dealt with the state of poverty at the present time. He said—

> "Out of a population in these islands of 68,000,000, 20,000,000 were always poor 12,000,000 were always on the verge of starvation, and 1,000,000 were always unemployed."

He invited the hon. Member to say why those 20,000,000 people who were always poor and those 12,000,000 people who were always on the verge of starvation, and the 1,000,000 people who were always unemployed were to pay more for their coal in order that the coal miners might enjoy shorter hours. At this point the supporters of the Bill took refuge in declamation and humanity. When they came to the humanity argument they found that the whole case, as far as the health of and danger to the colliers were concerned, had been shattered and destroyed by the Report of the Committee. [Cries of "No, no."] Hon. Gentlemen below the gangway questioned that statement, but up to the present none of them had dared to question it by reasoned arguments in debate. What did the Committee say on that point? They said—

> "While the risk of fatal accident is much greater than among males generally, the risk of death by disease is much lower, their mortality being 10·6 less than that of all occupied males and 23·2 less than that of all males."

So that as far as the general health statistics which had been quoted were concerned no case whatever had been made out for any special treatment of miners. Now they came to the accident statistics, and what was the case of the Government? The accident statistics were lower than those of sailors, for whom no one proposed to legislate. The Government had no case at all, because on their own showing if eight hours was introduced the men were going to work holidays and short days, so that the total time exposure to accident would hardly be reduced at all. They had had some figures of great assistance in discussing this question of the health and danger to miners supplied by the hon. Member for the Ince Division in the course of the late debate. The Home Secretary based certain statistics upon the mortality or accidents to men above the age of sixty-five years, but the hon. Member for the Ince Division gave the right hon. Gentleman and the House some interesting figures which, at the moment, were not before the right hon.

Gentleman, and which perhaps the House would like to have placed again before it as to the number of men above the age of sixty-five years who were employed in mines. The hon. Member for Ince, who he was sure was very accurate in his figures, stated that one in seventeen of the men employed in the mines to-day was above the age of sixty-five. He further stated that the total number of men working underground at the present time was 757,887. So that they arrived at the fact, taking 1 in 17 as the proportion, that there were 44,581 men above the age of sixty-five who were at present working underground as hewers in the mines. [Cries of "No."] That was how the figures worked out. It was useless to cry "No": the calculation spoke for itself. The number above ground on the same calculation was 177,081, and taking 1 in 17 again that gave a total of 10,416. So that the total number of men at the present time above the age of sixty-five employed in mines was no less than 54,997. That was really a very respectable total for a trade which was considered to be so unhealthy. Was there a single other manual occupation that could show results like these? It was for those engaged in this occupation that the very poor of these Islands were asked to make the sacrifices which were put forward in this Bill on the special ground of their health and safety. The right hon. Gentleman attempted to curdle the blood of the House——

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): No, no.

MR. F. E. SMITH said he would assume that that was not his object, although it seemed to be the effect of his words. He did not know whether the mine which the Home Secretary gave as an illustration was that in which the right hon. Gentleman himself was either proprietor or part proprietor. The right hon. Gentleman said, in giving his own experience—

> "I know what it is in the working faces when there is not a direct current of air, when the air is stagnant and grows foul."

If the right hon. Gentleman knew that that was the case, if he actually came across working faces where the air was foul and stagnant because there was no direct current of air, it was his duty to report himself as a mine-owner to himself, the Home Secretary, for having broken Rule No. 1 of the Coal Mines Regulation Act, which provided penalties for this very case. It was quite clear that the right hon. Gentleman's amateur judgment was quite deceived by conditions which were very normal. Now he wished to add a word or two upon the amazing postponement of the operations of this beneficent measure for five years. Here was a Bill commended with great eloquence upon humanitarian grounds which was alleged to be necessary to preserve the safety of miners, and yet for some unaccountable reason such was the callousness and inhumanity of the Government that these enormous advantages to the mining population were to be withheld for five years. What could the explanation be in regard to this delay? Could it be that the Government were now alive to the extreme improbability that they would be sitting where they were in five years, and that they preferred that this disagreeable issue should be contested, when it was contested, not by themselves, but by their successors? It was perfectly clear that one result of introducing this five years provision was that Parliament deliberately excluded itself from the teachings of five years experience which were to follow upon what was admitted to be an experiment in the Bill in a provisional shape. Had any reason been advanced why Parliament should cut itself adrift from the teachings of the next five years? None except the importance of avoiding momentary trouble. The Prime Minister, in discussing this question, must have apostrophised his unwarlike colleague—

> "Give peace in our time, because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only Thou."

They were told that they could derive no useful lesson from the reception which this Bill was receiving at bye-elections. He noticed that those who represented the miners in this respect explained that the constituencies had been deceived at recent bye-elections by mercenary statements made by the representatives of the mine-owners. That explanation suggested some curious and interesting reflections upon the subject of government by democracy. He supposed the Labour Party was the most democratic Party, and it had always been a source of surprise to him that when the democracy had come to a decision which was hostile to their self-appointed exponents the democracy had always been deceived. If it was on the Licensing Bill that an adverse decision had been come to, the people of this country were the credulous dupes of an odious trade. If, on the other hand, an adverse decision was come to with reference to the question of an eight-hour day, then they had been misled and deceived by the statements made by the hired minions of the mine-owners. If hon. Members below the gangway provided an accurate reflex of the voice of the democracy, and had tongues in their mouths, could they not go to the constituencies and controvert those grave misstatements instead of whining about them elsewhere? [AN HON. MEMBER: Which they did do in Manchester.] The hon. Gentleman said they did do it in Manchester. He could not congratulate them on the success of their effort. He could not recollect whether the Socialist candidate obtained a hundred votes. For himself, he firmly believed that the people of this country had plainly grasped the general principle of this privilege-creating measure. He had no hesitation whatever in the vote he would give on the Second Reading, and fortified himself in giving that vote by an admirable observation which was made by the hon. Member for Mid-Durham, whose experience in these matters was immeasurably greater than that of the hon. Members who declaimed from the Labour benches. The hon. Member addressing his fellow-workmen said—

> "You have power in your own hands, and to come to Parliament begging and beseeching is derogatory to our character as men."

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland): The hon. and learned Member who has just sat down has declared that we on this side of the House are disposed to charge him and his friends with inhumanity. For my part I have no desire to make any such charge against them, but I do most specifically charge him and his friends with the grossest political inconsistency in opposing the present Miners' Eight-Hours Bill. Year after year in this House measures, precisely the same in principle, and, as the hon. and learned Member truly said, more drastic in their details, have been proposed, and when these have been before Parliament, never on any occasion has any responsible Leader of hon. Members opposite raised his voice in protest against such a Bill. While the right hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, who spoke against this Bill at a previous stage of the discussion, and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, year after year, and decade after decade, kept repressed within their bosoms the fires of indignation which are now allowed to blaze forth, others of their colleagues were active in this House and the country advocating this very Bill, which we are now told is disastrous to the liberty of the subject and most injurious to the commercial prosperity of the country. If I am obliged to mention the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, I do so in no degree in order to attack him, for his absence from this House under circumstances which we all deplore, must necessarily close our lips. But it is necessary to this argument to say that in 1894, shortly before an important general election, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, declared himself in a speech at Birmingham strongly in favour of what he called an experimental eight-hours day in the mining industry. Following that speech, leaflets and posters were issued by the million all over the country, containing what was called Mr. Chamberlain's Programme. I have here an extract from one of these. There were eight points in that programme, one of which is an Eight Hours Bill for the mining industry. While the right hon. Gentleman was carrying on an active propaganda on these lines—I remember posters were to be seen on every hoarding containing this very programme, and on the strength of it I believe thousands and tens of thousands of votes were won for hon. Members opposite—while he was carrying on this propaganda, endorsed as it was by Lord

Salisbury, the then Leader of the Conservative Party, not one of his colleagues disavowed that policy, and from that day to this I do not think a single Leader of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite has raised a word of protest against the Miners' Eight Hours Bill. I cannot understand how right hon. Gentlemen opposite can reconcile their attitude to-day with their attitude in previous years, and we are entitled to ask any right hon. Member on the opposite side who takes part in the debate this specific question: How can they venture to denounce not merely the details, not merely the method and extent of the application of this Bill, but the very purpose and principle of the Bill itself, which their distinguished colleagues have actively advocated in the country?

The speech of the hon. and learned Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool, like most of the other speeches made against the Bill, turned out so much on the question of principle as on the question of its actual effect. Will the effect of this Bill in practice be to impose a heavy or appreciable burden on the poorer classes of the country and upon the industries of the country? I fully admit, and my right hon. friend the Home Secretary has admitted again and again, that if it were to cause the price of coal to rise permanently 1s. 6d. or 2s. per ton, or any sum approaching that, the effect would be most injurious on the industries of the country, and even a stronger case would have to be made out for the Bill than has yet been made out. But the question of the effect is to be solved not by the indignant rhetoric of the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, but by careful economic inquiry, and we are not prepared to accept as necessarily accurate the estimates of cost given by the coal-owners themselves. The hon. and learned Member has said that the estimates which have been made by experts that there would be a permanent increase in the price of coal of 1s. 6d. to 2s. per ton have not been seriously challenged. These statements have been challenged and disputed again and again, and if we leave the statements made by deputations, and by hon. Members in speeches in the House of Commons, and turn to statements made at bye-elections, in which the hon. and learned Member takes such an interest, we shall find even more grossly exaggerated statements than those which have been quoted. I have here a leaflet which was issued at the Pudsey bye-election. [OPPOSITION cheers.] I do not know whether hon. Members will cheer the statement that it contains. The leaflet says that the consequence of this Bill will be an increase in the price of coal, not temporarily, but always, of 5s. per ton, or 3d. per cwt. and that every vote for the Liberal candidate is a vote for dearer coal. That is what the hon. and learned Member calls the people of this country firmly grasping the principle of this measure. I think there is little glory and little credit in winning bye-elections by methods of this kind.

Whenever any measure for the regulation of labour and the improvement of the industrial conditions of the people has been proposed, without exception it has been denounced by those who are interested parties on the other side as likely to impose burdens infinitely greater than have actually been caused. I came across the other day an ancient precedent, but it is so apt that I cannot refrain from quoting it to the House. It was the case of one of the early Factory Bills in 1830, proposed for the limitation of the hours of labour of children of six years of age and upwards, who were in those days working in textile mills thirteen to sixteen hours a day, under the lash of the overseer. A petition was presented to this House from the textile employers in one part of Yorkshire declaring in precisely the same language as is used to-day, that no one more than themselves desired to benefit all classes of work-people, but that if the hours of these children were reduced as proposed it would be utterly impossible for them to make profits, that Parliament must remember the continual pressure of foreign competition, and that nothing could be more pernicious than legislation interfering with the methods of industry and the processes of trade. That is an old precedent. I come down to a more recent one, and one which touches this very trade, and the Mining Association which is so active in putting before the country these exaggerated statements. I turn to a deputation which was received by the late Lord Salisbury, accompanied by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and Sir Matthew White Ridley. It consisted of the leaders of the coal-owners of the country and was in opposition to the Workmen's Compensation Bill of 1897. The president of the Mining Association on that occasion said that that Bill would react on the number of men employed, that general disaster would follow the passage of the Bill, and that the amount of liability ought to be reduced. He further said that he feared the price of coal would be affected, and that the burden imposed by the Bill would amount to 2d. to 3d. per ton. Those right hon. Gentlemen opposite paid not the slightest attention to them, or to those estimates. They went on with the Bill as it stood. They knew the statements were exaggerated for the purposes of political propaganda, and the result proved that that was the case. After some years the Home Secretary appointed a Departmental Committee with a view to amending legislation on the same subject, and then it was found, from the evidence of the coal-owners, that the actual cost of the Workmen's Compensation Act had amounted not to 2d. or 3d., but to just over ½d. per ton. The Mining Association on that occasion was wrong, no less than 80 per cent. in their estimate. I think there is reason to believe that the wrongness on this occasion will be an even higher percentage. The Departmental Committee presided over by the hon. Member for Gloucester has been praised, and rightly praised, by both sides of the House. That Committee carefully considered the estimates laid before them by the mine-owners, including this 1s. 6d. or 2s. increase in the price to which hon. Members have referred, and the Committee unanimously declared that that estimate could not be in any way accepted and that it was far beyond the mark. I do not propose to-day to enter into the details of the economic aspect of this question. My right hon. friend the Home Secretary has done so effectively. My hon. friend the Member for Gloucester also dealt with it very fully, and I believe the President of the Board of Trade will refer to it again. I would only mention two facts in this connection. One is a precedent which comes from another country, Austria, where the hours of labour in mines have been reduced by law. In 1902 the hours were reduced from twelve, bank to bank, with ten actually spent in work, to nine, bank to bank. What occurred in the first year was an increase in the output per man per shift of 3·9 per cent., and in the second year of 6·6. The reduction of the hours from twelve to nine in Austria has been followed by an actual increase in the product of the mineral, so that this one illustration is enough to show that we cannot assume that a decrease in hours necessarily means a decrease in the output. There is another point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House. It is this. We had from the hon. Member for Gloucester, who was the chairman of the Departmental Committee, at an early stage of the debate, a most judicious, thoughtful, and convincing speech, which I am sure carried weight in all quarters of the House. The hon. Member who spoke last accepts my hon. friend as authoritative when he speaks in censure of the terms of the Bills proposed by the mining Members, but he ceases, I suppose, to regard him as authoritative when he supports the Second Reading of the Bill. The hon. Member for Gloucester put these two questions. He said: "Will this Bill lead to a temporary shortage which, although small in amount, would have the effect of raising the price of coal for a time to an exorbitant figure?" and, secondly, "Would it lead to a permanent but smaller rise in the price of coal?" My hon. friend, speaking not only with the knowledge that he has personally of the trade but with the further knowledge gained as chairman of the Committee, answered both these questions in the negative. He said that the Bill, as proposed to be amended by the Government, and if further amended in two particulars, would not have that effect. Now these two particulars in no way touch the substance or essence of the Bill. My hon. friend would like to see the Bill come into full operation, as we propose it should come into operation, at the end of five years, but that instead of an eight-hours day being established in five years in two steps, he desired it should be established in three. Secondly, he proposed that at the end of five years there should be not an eight hours day *plus* one winding, but a seven and a half hours day *plus* two windings. There is no difference in substance; there is only a slight difference in arrangement and administration. But with these two alterations in the Bill, which, of course, will receive due consideration when the Bill is in Committee, my hon. friend declared, speaking with the authority which the House is ready to recognise, that this Bill would in his judgment cause neither a sudden and temporary exorbitant rise in the price of coal nor a permanent small rise in that price. With that expression of opinion, I think hon. Members may, with an easy mind, as we members of the Government can do, support the Second Reading of the Bill.

The hon. Member for the Walton Division asked: "Why should miners in particular have the benefit of this legislation?" That is a question which has been asked over and over again in the course of these debates. "Why should miners have a preference over all other trades in the country whose work is as burdensome, and many of whom work as long hours as miners; why should this one industry be placed in this privileged position?" Well, there are two reasons. The first is that if you take into account the severity of the labour which is performed by the miners; if you take into account the extreme danger of their occupation, and the great discomfort of working day after day and year after year for one's whole working life below ground, out of the sunlight, away from the light of day, there is no trade in the whole country which for a moment stands in a similar position or can make a claim in an equal degree for a fuller measure of leisure for the men engaged in it. The second reason is that for twenty years this proposal has been made by the miners. For twenty years it has been discussed again and again in Parliament, and has, on some occasions, been unanimously endorsed by the House of Commons. We hold that, whatever may be the case for any other trade, the time is fully ripe for this measure to pass into law. When nearly 1,000,000 men engaged in an industry ask for such legislation for the benefit of men who are overworked in the class to which they belong, it needs stronger arguments against the Bill than have been offered by hon. Gentlemen opposite before Parliament would be entitled to reject it. There is another argument in favour of the Bill, although I do not attach so great importance to it as those that I have just stated. This movement for an eight-hours day in the mines is not merely a national movement; it is an international movement. Already the hours of labour in mines in Germany and the United States of America are shorter than they are here. Already France has legislated with the view of securing an eight-hours day for miners, although the measure on her Statute-book does not go as far as this Bill. An amending Bill has, however, now been introduced. Already Belgium is treading along the same path. There was a time when England led the whole world in industrial legislation. It was one of the proudest boasts of our Parliament that it was so. But during the ten years of reaction between 1895 and 1905 in that, as in many other things, we have fallen into arrear. But I am sure the House will agree that it ought not to be said that it is England which is holding back the other countries in the world, that it is long hours here, unfair competition from England, which prevent the miners of those countries from gaining the boons which they ask for.

And lastly, I put this point, and I ask for it the most earnest consideration of the House. What is the alternative to this Bill? If this Bill is rejected by hon. Members opposite, as they wish it to be rejected, what will be the consequences? We are told: "Here is an organised trade, with a strong trade union, well able to look after itself. Why should Parliament interfere? If the men want an eight-hours day why not allow them to secure it by their own efforts?" The hon. Member for Rhondda Valley told us that in South Wales, where the miners work ten to eleven hours all the year round, three times they had been to the employers and asked them to agree with the miners for a shorter working day, and that that appeal had been three times rejected. Well, if this Bill is not to be passed, and if the miners are to be left to their own devices and to the strength of their own organisation, it means a coal strike, and nothing else. The right hon. Member for St. George's clearly suggested that in a speech the other day. He told us that the laws in restraint of competition had been repealed, that the Trade Disputes Act had been passed. What more do you want? Why not take advantage of that, he suggested. I do not think that that is an eventuality which the House will contemplate with any degree of equanimity. All the suffering of women and children involved by a gigantic strike; all the poverty imposed on respectable families of working men plunged into debt; all the dislocation of trade; all the indirect effect on other industries as well as on their own industry; and in the end the men, perhaps, starved into submission—and the position to remain as it was before: that, let it be understood, is the policy suggested by the Opposition. The policy of the Government is this Bill.

*MR. BECK (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech) desired to say only a few words on this measure. In the first place, he frankly confessed that he knew nothing about the coal industry, but he had listened with great and anxious care to the debate that day, and on the occasion when the Bill was last before the House, and moreover had read a considerable amount of matter on the subject, and he had come to the conclusion, with great reluctance, that the promoters of the Bill had been defeated in argument by those who were opposed to it. He could not be expected to admit that there was, either on the Ministerial benches or on those below the gangway opposite, a lack of ability, and he could not help thinking therefore that it was the case for the Bill which was weak. They had had speeches describing the hard case of the miners and the long hours they worked. He had the honour to represent an agricultural constituency, and he thought of the hours worked by those who returned him to Parliament, and of the misery caused by the temporary rise in the price of fuel last winter; and it seemed his duty to oppose, with the greatest reluctance, on behalf of his constituents the Bill now before the House. There was one phrase used by the hon. Member for Ince in the very interesting speech which he made on the last occasion which particularly struck him. He said that the miners—the husbands, fathers, and brothers—had a right to a larger share of home life than they enjoyed at present, and that those dependent upon them had a right to a greater share of their society. He questioned whether these men did not get a far greater share of home society than ninety-nine out of every 100 of his constituents. He questioned whether it was right to penalise the overwhelming majority of the workers of the country for the sake of a comparatively small part of the population, and whether it was not a fact that a great majority of the workers would be only too happy to exchange conditions with those employed in the great coal-mining trade of the country. He would not have intervened in the debate if he had not decided after much thought to vote against the Government. As he had said, he knew nothing of the trade and was merely there to listen to the debate and to try and understand all about this complicated measure; and it seemed to him that the arguments against the Bill were practically overwhelming, that they had not been adequately met, and that that proved conclusively that there was no possibility of meeting them. As regarded the charge of political inconsistency levelled against the Members of the Opposition by the hon. Member who had just sat down, it was one of the advantages of being a new Member that one had no political history, and that therefore his withers were entirely unwrung. Although consistency was a very noble virtue it was a very doubtful whether in politics it was a virtue at all. The Report of the Commission very considerably altered the argument for the Bill. Not many of those who voted on a Friday afternoon and on private Members nights had any but a very hazy knowledge of the subject under discussion. He, at any rate would be exceedingly sorry that he should be forced for the rest of his life to support many things which he had voted for in a nebulous frame of mind. He had already said that he knew nothing practically about the coal industry, but he had pondered very long on the subject of the Bill, and with great reluctance he should be bound, as a matter of principle, to vote against it.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said the Bill had met with a degree of opposition which, apart from licensing measures, was unparalleled in his experience of Parliamentary Bills. Most of the Members in the House had received that morning a document from the Coal Consumers' League. At one time he thought of asking Mr. Speaker's opinion as to whether or not it did not come very near being an attempt to intimidate Members of the House of Commons. He would read, if he was in order, one paragraph from that document bearing on the statement which he had just made. The third paragraph read thus—

> "A recent Resolution passed at the Emergency Conference of the Associated Chambers of Commerce called upon the members of the commercial community to rise above political considerations and defend the country's commerce, and to this end to offer to the Government during the whole of the stages of this Bill relentless opposition, both in the House of Commons and in the country."

That of course, was perfectly allowable, but then the document went on to say this—

> "This call is being magnificently answered, and the Government, if they persist in this measure, will learn during the next few weeks that there is pitted against them the solid ranks of the manufacturers of the kingdom, who have sunk their politics in the determination to protect their trades."

He had a much higher appreciation of the intelligence of the commerical community of this country than to believe that any of them had any apprehension as to his trade being in danger through the passing of this Bill, or any Bill of the kind. A statement of that kind was merely a piece of political bluff used for the purpose of frightening and intimidating timid Members of the House against voting for the Bill. He did not intend to recapitulate the arguments so often used with regard to the conditions of the miners. One argument that had been urged before in the course of the debate was that a mine was not exactly a health resort, and he wished to make two points upon that subject. They were told that the death-rate among miners was low, but to those of them who had had the misfortune to be born and reared in colliery villages and who had had to work in the pits, the explanation was obvious. People of weak health left mining and went to work in other occupations above ground; consequently those who remained and went into the mines were the healthiest members of the mining community. That in itself had a considerable effect in reducing the death rate of miners. Then with regard to the 54,997 persons employed underground who were over fifty years of age, to whom the hon. Member for Liverpool, who used the figures, referred, they were not hewers, they were not the actual workmen who were producing the coal, and a little more knowledge of this subject would have convinced the hon. Member that the bulk of these men were managers, officers, and others in similar positions—officials generally—and that so far as the actual working miner was concerned, the actual hewer, his statement was far from true. A great deal had been made of the Report of the Committee which inquired into this measure, and upon whose Report this Bill was based. The hon. Member for Liverpool, like others, quoted certain statements from that Report. It was needless to say that they quoted statements which best supported their view of the case. But the most extraordinary thing was that the statements quoted were not taken from the Report itself, but were taken from the reasons of the Committee which culminated in the Report. If hon. Members turned to the Report they would find that at the present time the average week at present worked was a week of forty-three hours and thirteen minutes, which spread over six days gave an average of seven hours and a quarter a day for each day of the week. The Committee said—

> "After analysis and inquiry we believe that a certain portion of the time now lost could be utilised under a legally restricted day."

The point of that statement was that the average time now being worked in collieries, partly through the arrangement as to stop days and partly through broken days from causes over which the colliery companies had no control, was largely under the eight hours proposed by the Bill. If that were so, taking the country as a whole, there would be no reduction of output under the Bill, and as a consequence no increase in the price of coal. That seemed obvious.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): The miners do not work on Saturday.

***Mr. KEIR HARDIE** said they did not require to work on Saturday. Let them take Scotland. At the present time, during the past few months, twenty collieries had been closed down altogether owing to the falling off of the demand. In all the districts in Scotland the time worked was under four days a week. The men were perfectly willing to work five and a half days a week, eleven days a fortnight, if there was a demand for them to do so. His contention was that under the Bill, instead of working three and a half days of nine hours each per week, they would have to work four or five days if the demand was the same under the eight-hours day of the Bill. But he would take again the Report of the Committee as meeting the point just raised by the hon. Member opposite: this was what the Committee said—

> "The hours of labour in mines at present vary from six and a half in Durham to ten hours in Monmouthshire."

He asked the hon. Member's attention to this because it seemed to him that this bore upon the point he had just raised. The Report went on to say—

> "After deducting stop days and short days the average time worked is forty-nine hours and fifty-three minutes a week."

What this Bill proposed to do was to strike off the one hour and fifty-three minutes a week, and that being so he repeated that the apprehensions which had been raised as to the terrible effects of this Bill would be absolutely groundless.

Mr. MARKHAM: If I may interrupt the hon. Gentleman for a moment, I should like to remark that the Nottingham Miners' Association has passed a Resolution that no pit shall work on a Saturday, and no pit has worked in that district on a Saturday for many years.

***Mr. KEIR HARDIE** said he quite understood, but he was afraid that the hon. Member had not been listening to what he had been reading. The Committee said that after deducting stop days and short days the average time worked was forty-nine hours and fifty-three minutes, and that being so all that this Bill proposed to do was to strike off one hour and fifty-three minutes a week. He had already pointed out that with the broken time now suffered the actual output under the Bill would not be reduced, because the miners then would work for five days at eight hours instead of four days at ten hours each, as in the case of Monmouthshire. He came now to the question of cost; that was the crux of the debate. The great question was whether the Bill would increase the cost of production. Obviously if it did not decrease the output it would not increase the cost of production, and their argument was that in the working of the Bill it would not increase the cost except in certain districts. It would do so, of course, so far as South Wales was concerned, but not in other cases. Let them assume that there would be a slight increase of cost under the Bill owing to the reduction of two hours per week. The profits now being made in the coal trade were more than amply sufficient to meet the increase in the cost. He had in his hand a return from the balance sheets of some twenty of the leading colliery companies of Great Britain. He would not trouble the House by reading the whole list, but he would like to give figures showing the premium at which the shares of these companies were now being sold in the market, the purchase of shares being a very fair indication of the earning power of the colliery—the dividend earning power. He had made a selection from all parts, England, Scotland, and Wales. The shares of the Ashley Tidsley Colliery Company were selling at a premium of 205 per cent. The North Navigation Colliery, Limited, that was a Welsh concern, their preference shares were selling at 105 per cent. The Bear Pit Colliery

Company, Limited, they were selling at 118¾ per cent. The Colliery Company shares were selling at 335 per cent. The Fife Colliery Company, Limited—that was a colliery working in a district in which the eight-hour day had been in operation for thirty years—were selling their shares at a premium of 500 per cent. Another coal and iron company was 175 per cent., and Wilson Clyde Coal Company, Scotland, was 321 per cent. He submitted that assuming there would be a slight increase in the cost of the production of coal owing to the operation of this Bill, the enormous profits which were now being made by these concerns, and which had been continuously earned for the past twelve or fourteen years, could be taxed to meet the extra cost without calling upon the consumer to pay one single farthing extra. Perhaps that could best be shown if he took a concrete case. He had compiled from nine collieries in Durham, where the working day of the hewer was six and a half hours, figures taken from their own balance sheets for the year 1906. The average selling price of coal in Durham for that year was 6s. 5d. per ton at the pit top. The profits from these collieries declared upon them after providing for depreciation, sinking fund, mineral royalties and other charges, were £753,000, and the output was just over 14,000,000 tons. The number of persons employed was 37,617. The average profit returned from these collieries worked out at just a trifle over 1s. per ton. The profit per miner employed in those collieries was £20 0s 4d. per annum. The dividends paid worked out at an average of £20 0s. 4d. a year for each man and boy employed in the nine collieries. Therefore, he submitted that even assuming that this Bill would increase the cost of production there was a clear and ample margin to draw upon, without adding one penny either to the cost of the coal of the labourer, of the poor in our big cities, or for our manufacturers.

Sir GEORGE DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby): The price of coal is much too high now.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE: Exactly so. Lest it should be said that the figures were abnormal and peculiar to one year he wished to quote two sets of figures from the *Newcastle Chronicle* of 22nd June, 1908, ten days ago. They gave first of all the profits of a Welsh colliery company. They did not give the name. It appeared in the commercial column of the *Newcastle Chronicle*, and might be taken as genuine. In 1904–5 the dividends on that colliery, paid by that colliery company, amounted to £74,000; in 1906, £89,000; in 1907, £128,000; in 1908, £183,000. That was a progressive increase each year for this Welsh coal company. Now he came to a North Country coal company, the figures being taken from the same source. In 1904–5 the profits of the North Country coal company were £88,000; the name in this case, as in the other, was not given. The profits in 1906, were £161,000 in 1908, £266,000.

Viscount CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): Has the hon. Gentleman got the figures for 1890?

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said he was giving the figures up to last year; 1890 was a long way back. It was eighteen years ago; it was ancient history. He had said, in the course of his remarks, that the profit during the past twelve or fourteen years had been the best ever known in any similar period of the history of the coal trade of this country. And it should be remembered that these were the years in which ruin was predicted because of the Workmen's Compensation Bill and other measures of that kind. On that point might he quote an authority which he thought would still carry weight with hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the Conservative side of the House. This measure had been before Parliament now for twenty-one years. In 1887 the late Stephen Williamson was requested by the Scottish miners to introduce an Amendment into the Mines Regulation Bill, then going through the House, in favour of eight hours a day for boys in Scotland. It was defeated. In the following year he wrote to the late Mr. Gladstone, and also to the late Lord Randolph Churchill, asking for their opinion and attitude towards the Eight Hours Bill of the Miners. In the course of a lengthy reply, Lord Randolph Churchill wrote as follows—

"As at present informed, I know nothing which will prevent me from voting for the principle of such a measure which might be submitted to Parliament, provided that the persons who are qualified and competent to speak directly on behalf of the Labour interest were in its favour."

That condition this year at least was fulfilled in regard to the Miners Eight-Hours Bill. His hon. friends opposite, who had so long and so ably conducted their opposition to this matter, were now no longer in opposition. They had, therefore, unanimity in regard to it. Lord Randolph Churchill went on to say:

> "Eight hours labour, eight hours sleep, and eight hours mental and bodily recreation seem to me to be an ideal which a democratic legislature in its care for the welfare of the whole people may wisely and profitably endeavour to aim at."

Then he further goes on to point out—

> "If that tends to a diminution of the great mass of unemployed at present existing, as might be reasonably expected, and also probably to a diminution, though not necessarily a large diminution, of the profits of the capitalists, the latter disadvantage, if disadvantage it be, would be largely outweighed by the very great social and political advantages which would be secured by the establishment of a higher standard of comfort and contentment among our labouring population."

That was their case to-day. It might be that the Bill would make slight inroads on the profits now being made on the coal mines. But against that loss to individuals they placed the welfare of nearly 1,000,000 of their workpeople. The hon. Gentleman on his right had said that industry was being crippled through the high price of coal. He agreed. They were not responsible for that. The profits in the North of England on coal getting had in some cases increased by over 100 per cent. The dividends had doubled, and there was a 5 per cent. increase on the wages of the men. There went to the men 5 per cent. increase, and to the coal owner 100 per cent. increase. These were the men who, out of their bloated dividends, were providing the money to mislead the country in regard to this measure. He had seen many statements in regard to Bills before that House, but nothing more absurdly ridiculous had been said about any measure than had been said about the present Bill at election time. He ventured to say that there was not a man on those benches or among those who were opposed to the Bill who would go into a mining constituency and repeat the statements he had made in that House. For twenty-one years the colliers of the country, by an overwhelming majority, and now with unanimity, had asked Parliament to pass this Bill. What was the alternative? The House might refuse to pass the Bill, or the House might so amend it as to make it impossible for the miners to accept it. What was the alternative? The miners were determined to have the eight hours day either by the peaceful methods of legislation, or by the more barbarous method of a strike. If a strike occurred it would not be merely Lancashire and Yorkshire, Durham and Northumberland, or Scotland and Wales, which would strike, but it would be the whole country, and every colliery in Great Britain would come to a stop until the eight hours day had been won. Surely the hon. Gentlemen who feared the effect of this measure upon trade, could hardly contemplate a crisis of that kind with equanimity. Then as to the argument about the poor. Last winter when there was a slight spell of cold in this city of London, these men who controlled the markets doubled the price of coal to the poor in order to enhance their own ungodly profits. Knowing what the effect of the Bill would be, knowing it would bring a release from imprisonment in the mines to hundreds of thousands of sturdy, honest decent fellows, knowing also that our industries would not suffer, and that the price of coal would not be increased, they asked, the House to pass the Bill in such a form as would give this long desired reform and prevent the greatest industrial dispute of which this country had any record.

Mr. Keir Hardie.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire) said he looked upon this subject from a different standpoint from that taken by his hon. friend behind him and the hon. Member who had spoken from above the gangway opposite. He agreed with the hon. Member for Leeds in the admirable speech which he made a fortnight ago. He was particularly interested in that passage of his remarks which showed how the moral, intellectual, and social condition of the younger generation of miners would be enormously improved by the passing of this Bill. He welcomed the Bill because he thought it was an attempt to define the relationship between capital and labour. In defining the relation between capital and labour they ought to begin by finding a way to make the labourer more comfortable and a more worthy citizen. When a man had been an excessive number of hours at labour he went out of it fagged, his brain too tired to think. It was a reasonable division that he should have eight hours work, eight hours sleep, and eight hours to do what he pleased. This question interested him not so much because of the long hours of the labourer, but because when he looked round Christendom, with its two or three hundred millions of inhabitants, he found that a hundred millions at least did not get enough to eat from January to December. In Great Britain, with its forty-four odd millions of inhabitants, he did not think it was any exaggeration to say that ten millions at least got up in the morning and went to bed at night, having spent the whole day without getting bread enough to live on. It was impossible for these people to make intellectual or moral progress. They had not, as Charles Lamb said, been brought up but dragged up. They had never had a fair chance. They had been starved, mind and body. He was perfectly certain the only way for them to meet the question was to look it squarely in the face, and, if they possibly could, extend the eight-hours movement to every other trade in Great Britain, Putting aside all theories, every true lover of progress would admit that the mainspring of progress was good wages. The shilling or half-crown which was left over after the bills were paid on Saturday night meant education, self-respect, and manhood. It filled a town with good sanitary dwellings, and erected public libraries. It ensured progress and guaranteed it. Hon. Gentlemen opposite said that the Bill would threaten property and ruin trade, but, in the words of Bancroft, the fears of one class were not the measure of the rights of another. There was something more sacred than property, trade, and vested interests. He believed in trusting the people. One of the characters in Disreali's book, "Vivian Grey," said: "The people are not always right." Another replied: "The people are seldom wrong." If they trusted the people, the good and the bad, the wise and the ignorant, they would not necessarily get perfect institutions, but they would get the only institutions possible as long as human nature was the basis and the only foundation upon which they built. After all, what was education? It was not Greek and Latin and the air-pump. Book-learning did not make 5 per cent. of the mass of commonsense that made the world, transacted its business, and trebled its power over nature. The ideal Scotsman was not a scholar. Two-thirds of the inventions which had made Great Britain the workshop of the world did not come from the colleges or schools of science, but had struggled up, forcing their way through all obstacles; our workshops and not our colleges had made Great Britain the mistress of the world. Selborne, perhaps the profoundest scholar of his time, said: "No man is wiser for his learning." He thought that was probably merely an echo of the old Saxon proverb, which said: "No fool is a perfect fool until he learns Latin."

MR. PARKES (Birmingham, Central) said the speech they had just listened to was exceedingly eloquent, but it had very little to do with the Eight Hours Bill. It was rather inconsistent of the Home Secretary and the Under-Secretary when, on a previous occasion, they said that they on the Unionist side of the House did not take the trouble to oppose the provisions of the Bill. Now that they understood the position, and did take the trouble, they were taunted with their inconsistency, an inconsistency brought about entirely from the fact that the House of Commons and the public understood the question for the first time. After all, the question was not altogether what the front bench thought or what the back benches thought. The absolute question they had to consider was—would this Bill decrease the quantity of coal, would it increase the price, and was it approved by the commercial community? Anything that was for the benefit of the country as a whole, and of the miner in particular, he would not oppose, but the question was whether the Bill was for the benefit of the country as a whole. He very much doubted it, and he did not think at present the case for the Bill had been made out. The hon. Member for Merthyr had indulged in a good deal of talk about strikes which was a little out of place in a discussion of that kind. He did not think it was right to put a pistol at the head of those who opposed the Bill and the public generally by saying that if the Bill was not accepted there would be a devastating strike throughout the country. He believed there was a quite sufficient spirit of arbitration and conciliation amongst the miners and the proprietors of coal mines to settle any question in dispute without going to the arbitrament of a strike. He did not anticipate for a moment if they could not settle it in that House that it was without the bounds of settlement outside in a conciliatory manner. The hon. Member for Merthyr had also spoken of the dividends of the mines. That was not the question. The question before them was not what dividends the coal proprietors got, but whether the Bill would increase the cost of coal to the public. If the hon. Member had given them the dividends during the last twenty-five years of those particular mines, there might have been a little more consistency. It was often the case in the coal as well as in the iron trade, of which he knew something, that they might go for years without getting any dividends whatever, and then there might be a few years of improvement. That was the case, he believed, with the coal mines. In the last four or five years they had had a boom, but how did they get on for years and years before that boom? Unless a boom came in some businesses in this country, it would be very bad for them. The Under-Secretary for the Home Department had mentioned sixty hours in the factories. Was that a consistent analogy to the forty-three hours a week in the mines? No. Any trade which only worked forty-three hours in the week could not be said to be in a state of over-work. They were indebted very much to the Home Secretary for appointing the Departmental Committee. The right hon. Gentleman himself had rather sneered at the late opposition which came in like a flood in February, because of the Coal Consumers' League, but the great trades of the country, deputations of which came to him so numerously that they had sometimes to be lumped together in order to get time for hearing, were not moved by the Coal Consumers' League in the slightest degree. He attended one or two of those deputations, and the one he referred to specially was concerned with the iron, steel, and allied trades. They were unanimous against the Bill, and were of opinion that it would greatly increase the cost of coal. They were opposed to the Bill not because they wanted to do any harm to the miners, but simply because they thought it would interfere with the trade of the country. He remembered men getting up and giving their evidence as to what they thought would be the effect, and one after another said it would interfere to this extent. The cost of the coal used in various processes of manufacture was from 4 to 16 tons per ton of finished iron. Suppose the increase was not 1s. or 1s. 6d., but 6d. or 9d. Would anyone say when they had multiplied by 4 or 16 what the increase would be on the cost of manufacture? These manufacturers had not only to compete with the home producers, but also with an increasingly severe competition from abroad, and if they went on protecting the labour of this country in this way, so as to increase the cost of the articles produced, the tendency would be to reduce the production of those particular articles and in that way add to the number of the unemployed. The Under-Secretary had put forward two great reasons in favour of the Bill, namely, the severity of the labour and the great discomfort it caused to the miners. He (Mr. Parkes) had made particular inquiries with regard to the severity of the labour. He found that the man in a coal mine who was promoted to be a hewer of coal would not on any consideration if he could help it go and work on the top or on the bank. As a matter of fact the health of the miner was very much better than the health of the average worker in other trades; as a matter of fact, his health as far as longevity was concerned was above that of the man who worked on the bank. Whatever test they gave to health they would find that the miners stood in a very good position. With regard to discomfort he knew that the miner would sooner be down the pit during the hard winter than following any other form of labour. As to the severity of the labour and the discomfort arguments, in face of these facts they all fell to the ground. There were various tests which they ought to apply to this Bill. First of all, were the men overworked? He did not think that a man who worked only forty-three hours a week could be said to be overworked. Was the miner underpaid? He thought they might safely say that it was one of the best paid employments in the Kingdom. Was mining unhealthy? The statistics he had referred to and the Report of the Committee proved that that was not the case. Was the mining trade in a position to take care of itself? There was no trade so able to take care of itself. One of the greatest objections to the Bill was that it imposed a similarity of conditions on different districts. They could not, in consequence of the different conditions prevailing in different parts of the country, impose one set of conditions which would apply satisfactorily to all districts. The district he had in mind was South Staffordshire and the Cannock Pits. It was said that the coal miners might accelerate their speed of work, but even that was in itself a danger. It was said that the Bill would greatly decrease the tendency to accidents, but as a matter of fact it would increase that tendency. With regard to South Staffordshire, where they worked the thick coal, the two-shift system would be entirely inoperative. In those mines there had to be a great deal of repairing done to the roads and parts of the pits between the shafts, and that trouble was quite uniform in Staffordshire. If that part of the operation were hurried and not properly done the lives of the miners would be in danger. Then there was another thing with regard to South Staffordshire: there was frequently an enormous quantity of water in the mines which had to be pumped out by a pumping station specially erected for that purpose. If only a few of those pumps were stopped the working in the mines would also be stopped. If the Bill were carried in the way it was drawn it simply meant the destruction of the coal trade in that part of the country. He thought the opinion of the experts on the question in Staffordshire ought to be taken in preference to the opinion of the experts at the Home Office, and of other people who were not so greatly concerned in the trade itself. In the Cannock district, for example, they frequently worked only two and a half days per week. It was absolutely a season trade, and it would be absurd to employ two sets of men when, during part of the year, the men employed could only work two and a half days per week. For these reasons he maintained that it was impossible to frame one set of conditions in a universal eight-hours Bill which would be suitable to every part of the country. A good deal had been made of the mitigations mentioned in the Bill. At the present time the men worked forty-three hours and so many minutes per week, and it was assumed that the miners would work more regularly under the new system. That, however, was simply an assumption. He did not think himself that the men would be absent from work less under the new system than under the old. The hon. Member for South Glamorgan had referred to the opinions of the Chambers of Commerce, and said that they were dragooned by the Coal Owners' Association, and other similar bodies. Could they imagine 200 or 300 gentlemen from different parts of the country, representing the various Chambers of Commerce, all classes and trades, and altogether independent of politics, being dragooned by the Coal Owners' Association? He would say that if any body of men in this country was qualified to give an impartial opinion, entirely free from party bias, and which might be taken as the commercial Parliament of this country, it was the Associated Chambers of Commerce. That body decided almost unanimously to condemn this Eight Hours Bill for Miners. It was absolutely a slur upon the Chambers of Commerce of the country to say they were dragooned by the Coal Owners' Association. He did not think any case had been made out for the Bill. If the eight hours limit were imposed the trade would be very seriously injured. Every year competition was becoming more and more severe; if any hon. Member doubted that statement let him go into the iron and steel districts and he would see what they had to contend with at the present time. These were the questions they had to look at. He did not believe that the commercial opinion of the country was fully represented in the House of Commons upon this question. It was all very well to taunt the Opposition with not opposing the Bill before. They did not oppose it simply because they did not understand it; the Departmental Committee had been the means of their understanding it, and now that they did understand it they were opposed to it with all their might. There were times when the House of Commons did not represent the opinion of the country. He did not say there were not commercial men there who had opinions of their own, but the visible manifestations of those opinions was sadly lacking upon commercial questions. Therefore, he did not think they ought to be taunted with having abstained from opposition in the past and now rising to protest against the Bill. As a matter of fact, some of the districts would have to work longer hours than this Bill proposed, whilst other districts would have to work shorter hours. Almost every district had conditions peculiar to itself. They had their own way of working in a particular mine, and why should they not arrange some principle by which such cases could be met? It was fatal to the whole thing to have one cast-iron set of regulations supposed to meet all the varying conditions of mining. They ought certainly to have some arrangement by which each particular district could be dealt with on its merits. He knew there were some cases of hardship in South Wales, but why could not those particular districts be put into a different position? Why should they desire to apply this hard and fast cast-iron system to the whole country? By doing so they would wreck the interests of the country as a whole and fail to give that prosperity to the people which ought to be the object of all legislation. In this measure they were considering the interests of a small section of the community which was well able to take care of itself. It was a trade which was well paid and healthy, and in which the men were on good terms with their employers. It was really 42,000,000 people against 1,000,000, and by passing the Bill in its present form they were overlooking the interests of the 42,000,000 in favour of the infinitely smaller number who were well able to take care of themselves and whose grievances could be settled without this Bill in its present form.

MR. MARKHAM said that there had been considerable argument about the price of coal under the operation of an Eight Hours Bill. All prices were mere speculation and must, of course, be determined by the state of the market for the time being. It was impossible and indeed ridiculous that any Member of the House should say that the price of coal would increase 2s. or 3s. per ton in consequence of the Bill, because that entirely depended on the law of supply and demand. For example, the supply had only to be a little behind the demand for prices to rise out of all proportion. Therefore, those who spent their lives in and about coal mines had to consider the actual cost of working an eight-hours day as compared with the present system. Whether the price of coal would increase by reason of the reduced output which would inevitably follow depended upon the state of the market for the time being. If an eight-hours day had been passed in the first session of this Parliament he would not hesitate to say that the price of coal might have been 30s. a ton instead of 10s. The coal trade was now in a depressed condition. He was very sorry indeed to notice that the Labour Members were not present in larger numbers in an important debate of this kind.

MR. GLOVER (St. Helens): The Labour Members are absent because they are now holding a meeting.

MR. MARKHAM said that it was a very poor excuse and a very poor argument when an important Bill was down for consideration to say that hon. Members were attending another meeting. The effect of this Bill, so far as South Wales was concerned, would be very serious and there would be a large reduction in the output there. The hon. Baronet the Member for the Bosworth division and himself were directors of a large company in South Wales which produced over 1,500,000 tons of coal per annum. The House was aware what the hon. Baronet said about the profits of the coal trade, and he would like to give his own experience of the profits of mines with which he had been concerned during the last five years. The hon. Member for South Glamorganshire had given the case of two collieries in South Wales as if they were typical of the whole coal-mining industry. They did not show a fair average of the coal-mining industry. The hon. Member ought to have taken the whole of the South Wales mines if he wished to show the fair average. Instead of doing so, he had taken two of the best mines. In the case of one of the mines the whole of the capital had been built up by not spending any money on capital account and by paying no dividend for a long series of years. All these matters seemed never to have occurred to hon. Members who talked on the question. The collieries he was connected with during the last five years had raised 13,802,149 tons, they had paid in wages £3,596,190, and in dividends £443,600. The average profit over the past five years amounted to 7·7d. per ton in dividends. The Socialist Party told them that the men received 5 per cent. and the owners 95 per cent. The figures he had quoted showed that for every £1 paid in wages the companies got 2s. 6d., or in other words for every £100 paid in wages the profit was £12 10s. If a Socialistic Government took over the mines, as the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil desired, there would only be an addition of £12 10s. on every £100 paid in wages at the present time. That was, of course, after allowing for all the cost of equipping and sinking collieries and interest on the capital involved. In addition to that he contended that in many cases collieries did not set aside sufficient money for depreciation. There was no use referring to special collieries. Coal-mining depended on whether the conditions were favourable. Good collieries could make money while other collieries adjoining lost money. What they could only arrive at was the average, and though his own experience might be wrong he believed that in the last twenty years the profit made in coal mining on the average was not 6 per cent. on the capital value. It was not more in the companies with which he was associated. In his opinion the question of cost entailed by the Bill depended entirely upon the men themselves. In South Wales the men worked longer hours than in any other part of the country, except some districts of Lancashire, where they were practically the same. Even in Wales, where the men had always raised every possible obstacle to the introduction of modern methods of working, and where great difficulties existed for colliery managers and those connected with the undertakings, he believed if this Bill came into operation and the men met the coal-owners fairly in the matter by the introduction of double shifts, there would not be, so far as South Wales was concerned, an increase in the price of coal. It would be asked at once, "Where are the men who are going to work the double shifts?" He might say that in the case of a colliery with which he was associated there was one of the most able general colliery managers in the country, and he was of opinion, after going carefully through the figures, that even in the pits with which his company was associated, if they could work double shifts with the men they now had they would reduce the cost by at least 1s. per ton. That was to say, if, when the Eight Hours Bill came into effect, they closed half the working places in which coal was got and worked double shifts, the cost of getting coal would not be increased beyond what it was to-day. The men in South Wales, however, would not accept this as they did in the Midlands, Warwickshire and Nottingham. So far as he was concerned he did not think that his union friends could say that he had been hostile to their programme, that the men should receive a decent living wage, irrespective of the selling price of the commodity under the old sliding scale, but he said that under the ridiculous system now in force in South Wales the cost of getting coal must be enormously out of proportion to what it ought to be. He was not sure but that the cost of getting a ton of coal in South Wales to-day was 50 per cent. more than in the Midlands, where the conditions were practically the same. So far as the miners were concerned they had pursued a more enlightened course in the Midlands than in South Wales. The coal-owners in the Midlands had always been treated with what he might term good common sense in the management of their collieries. He might say that in a colliery with which he was connected in the Midlands he did not think that on the average the cost would be increased 3d. per ton. He thought that the maximum increase in the cost might be 6d., and that was in a case where the mining face was at a considerable distance from the shaft. In Yorkshire, Warwickshire, and Derbyshire, they were able to work double shifts and reduce the expense. In some cases they would be able to work three shifts. The difficulty in getting coal depended as he had said upon the men who were at the working face. He believed that the cost of getting coal in South Wales would be increased by at least 1s. per ton, while in the Midlands the increased cost would be approximately 3d. per ton, or in certain collieries a maximum of 6d. per ton. It had been said that this increased cost of getting coal would place the manufacturers of this country at a disadvantage in competing with the manufacturers of the world. Reference had been made to the effect on the iron industry and other industries by reason of this interference with the hours of labour. What were the facts? He had been down coal mines in all parts of the world, and he believed he was correct in saying that with the exception of the mines of Pennsylvania no coal was worked so cheaply as in this country, and therefore even with from 3d. to 6d. added in some cases to the present price of getting coal that would still leave us far and away above our competitors who were to-day taking large supplies from this country and paying freight and railway charges in addition to the price of the coal. We had in this country abundance of good steam coal. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil had spoken of two distinct classes of collieries, one producing steam coal and the other producing house coal. During the summer months the house coal mines worked short time because there was no market for what they produced. The production of the steam coal collieries was fairly even in both the winter and the summer months. During the coal boom of 1901 owing to sensational statements which appeared in the *Daily Mail*, and other papers of that class, people in the country got panicky on the question of the price of coal. Householders and others accordingly placed their orders for coal in the summer months, and the house coal collieries worked full time in the summer. People in the East End of London took in their coal supplies and put them away under beds by reason of the scare which had been created. The consequence was that the collieries were worse employed in the winter of 1901 than they had been for many years previously. If people bought their coal during the summer months, which they would not do, and which, he admitted, they could not do in many instances, he saw no reason why the output, so far as the Midland counties were concerned, should be decreased. So far as South Wales was concerned the position was different. There the miners were producing steam coal for which there was a steady market all the year round. If the cost of producing coal should increase 6d. per ton he wished the House clearly to understand that the coal-owners would have to increase the cost by 1s. That might seem an extraordinary statement to make, but it was absolutely common sense. If hon. Members would follow him he would explain how that came about. If they increased the cost of production by 6d., that meant for large and small coal. The additional cost would be incurred for the getting of the slack and small coal as well as the large, and, therefore, the coalowners would charge 1s. per ton more for the cobbles and large coal which householders consumed. That was what hon. Members did not see in the same way as those who were interested in the coal trade. About forty or fifty per cent. of the coal raised was slack which only fetched a small price. Hon. Members opposite knew perfectly well what was the position in South Wales, Appeals had been made to the House about the inhumanity of the colliery owners. It was true that they were producing coal at the high prices named, but the largest proportion of the money had gone to the men and not to the owners. If the hon. Member for Glamorgan saw the balance sheets of large companies he would find that over the last ten years the dividend had not been more than 3 per cent., and over the last five years not more than 6 per cent. He was not saying that the profits in the last year or two had not been large, but the hon. Member ought to have given a fair average of the profits made over a reasonable period. The hon. Member must be aware that these large companies had for years seen their shares continually depreciating in value.

MR. BRACE (Glamorganshire, S.) said that if the hon. Member would challenge the figures he had given as incorrect, he would know what to do, and would deal with it.

MR. MARKHAM said he did not deny the hon. Member's figures for a moment, but he denied that the case which he had put before the House was a fair illustration of what the coal-owners were doing in South Wales. The future in South Wales depended very much on how the men dealt with this question; because, unless something was done with the system of working in South Wales, the Bill would not only greatly decrease the output of coal, despite what hon. Members say, but——

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) said he denied that *in toto*.

MR. MARKHAM said that the hon. Member had not had the balance sheet of the companies placed before him, and he did not know that the cost of getting a ton of Welsh coal often amounted to from 9d. to 1s. in timber alone. The hon. Member lost sight of that consideration. South Wales had been the cock-pit of the dispute, and the men were worse off than those in the Midlands. He had fear about the future unless a new policy was brought forward in South Wales, but no fear about the Midlands where a policy of common sense had long prevailed.

*MR. HEMMERDE (Denbighshire, E.) said he had been somewhat surprised at some of the speeches from hon. Members opposite. They had heard something that day as to what had happened at recent bye-elections; but perhaps hon. Members had forgotten what happened at a few previous bye-elections. That became important when they were twitted by the right hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, about having put up their economic consciences to auction. What had been the history of this question during the last three years? For nearly twenty years previously it was not a question which was seriously opposed by either Party, and at the last general election practically every Member for coal-mining constituencies came back to the House to support this measure. Not only that but even during the late Administration the noble Lord the Member for Chorley, in seeking re-election on joining the Ministry, declared himself, presumably with the consent of his Leader, to be in favour of an Eight Hours Bill; and again when he stood at the general election for Chorley it was on the same platform. So that if they on that side of the House were putting up their economic consciences to auction at the last general election, there were other people in the same case. The noble Lord was returned for Chorley only on account of his promise to vote for the Eight Hours Bill. Immediately after the general election there was a bye-election in Cumberland when the Opposition candidate was heart and soul in favour of an Eight Hours Bill. If hon. Members would carry their memory a little further back to a bye-election at which he was returned to the House, they would remember that his opponent who sat in the last Parliament for the Tonbridge Division of Kent voted and fought against the Bill. But when the hon. Gentleman came down to a North Wales constituency, he (the speaker) thought that as he was fighting for the principle which he had always advocated before he went to a mining constituency, that his opponent would in accordance with his previously declared views speak and fight against it. Not at all; he became a convert to the Eight Hours Bill; and he received a letter of good-will from the Leader of the Opposition. That was in 1906. In the beginning of 1907 there was a bye-election in North East Derby, at which a miners' representative was returned and the Conservative candidate was Dr. Court. He went down into the division for two or three days, and found that Dr. Court was standing in that division as a supporter of the Eight Hours Bill, and was claiming that twenty years experience as a medical man had proved to him that an eight-hours day underground was the utmost that men could work if they were to lead healthy lives. That medical gentleman was also fortunate enough to receive the benediction of the Leader of the Opposition. Later on, however, under the patriotic auspices of the Coal Consumers' League there began the development of the great movement to protect the shipping of the country which some hon. Members opposite professed to be so deeply interested in and the Opposition began to repudiate the whole principle of an eight-hours day. They were told that the Report of the Committee had entirely changed the situation. But the Report told them nothing that they did not know in principle before. If there were adaptations of conditions to meet the new needs there would be no serious rise in the price of coal. They had heard from hon. Members of experience that the possible rise in South Wales might be put at 1s. per ton, and in other parts of the country at 3d. per ton or 6d. per ton. That was the result of experience, and the opinion of the Committee too was that 1s. 6d. per ton was an exaggeration. How came it then that hon. Members for election purposes not only said the rise would be 5s. per ton, but when taxed with that in the House, did not repudiate but cheered it? How could hon. Members, who only the other day were in favour of an eight-hours day, justify the use of figures like that, and declare that if an Eight Hours Bill were passed, it would result in the probable increase in the price of coal by 5s. per ton? Since when had hon. Members on the Opposition benches become the guardians of the price of coal? Many things had contributed to the price of coal which they were always busy defending, such as land monoply and the ownership of mines by private individuals. He referred them to a passage in the Report of the Royal Commission as to certain extensive areas of coalfields waiting development. That was what made the high price of coal. The more mines that were opened the more coal would be produced, and the lower would be the price of coal. The present system of taxing land favoured the restriction of the output of coal, and also high prices. Let hon. Members who talked of the rise in the price of coal crippling industry turn their attention to the taxation of land upon its capital value so as to bring it into the market.

Mr. LEVERTON HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney) asked if the hon. Member could give an instance of any owner of coal who was not anxious for the development of his property?

*Mr. HEMMERDE said he was pretty certain that there were coal-fields in his constituency that were in that condition. He had received a letter from a coal-owner in his constituency who did not seem prepared to deny that there were coal-fields in that district waiting development. He pointed out that if they were developed it would give employment to miners, and that by the present system of taxation which encouraged people to withhold their land from development, the price of coal was increased. In fact, the real remedy for dealing with this question was a root and branch reform of the land system. He thought the attitude of hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House when they came to ask the suffrages of a mining constituency was argument enough for the unanimity of the demand that was made. It was perfectly impossible for anybody, so great was the unanimity of this demand, to come forward in any mining constituency and not support the demand of the miners. If any hon. Member read the Report of the Committee with regard to the question of health of the miners and the hours which they worked they would find that matter not very deeply gone into, but quite apart from the question of health or the doctor's opinion of the effect of the hours upon their health there were certain matters familiar to them all, and he often wondered if hon. Members really believed that it was good for the health of any man to be underground for more than eight hours a day. He wondered whether hon. Members believed that any man could do hard physical toil of the character which these men did underground or overground for more than eight hours a day without suffering in health. He did not believe that they could, and although some doctors told him that they could he declined to throw over his own views and theories as well as to the effects of physical toil on men. Because many of these miners lived to an advanced age it did not show in the least that the life was a healthy one. They lived a very hard life and developed athletically, if he might say so, and physically, and the mere fact that these people happened to be healthier even than those who did no work did not in the least prove that physical toil for more than eight hours a day was good for them. It was his experience down in North Wales that the movement at the present time had its strongest supporters in the young men. It was what the Member for Ince said the other day, and it was his own experience as well, that the young men wanted leisure for recreation, and the ordinary light and pleasure of life. The human side of this question must enter into their thoughts. He found the real enthusiasm upon this question was among the very men who, if it was granted to them, would make the best use of it. He asked hon. Members if on a question that had been debated in this House for years they were going to change the whole of their views merely for the sake of an electioneering cry. The danger (if it existed) to our commerce must have been known for years. They could not possibly believe that simply to secure election or re-election hon. Members pledged themselves to a subject which they did not understand. They did them greater justice than that. Surely those who spoke for commercial England, and one hon. Member said the other day that there was not enough commercial men on the Ministerial side of the House—surely those who spoke for commercial England did not need to get their information from this Report; they must have known it for years. This danger of the rise in the price of coal as affecting the cost of production: had it not been thrown at the heads of all reformers who had tried to reform the hours and the conditions of labour of the workman? He did not suggest that they could continually reduce the hours of labour, and always get the same result, but did anybody suggest that the reduction of hours hitherto had ever had the result of increasing the cost of production? He remembered in a conference the other day upon the question of sweating Mr. Sydney Webb told a story of how he went over the great works of Sir Charles Tennant, and how Sir Charles pointed out many improvements that had been made by the men themselves to reduce the cost of production, when the cost looked like being increased by some advantages gained by the men for themselves by their unions. New machinery, new methods, a little more willingness among the men, and they would find they would not have a considerable rise in the cost of production at all. There might be a rise of just a few pence, but when they found hon. Members supporting their efforts to get into this House by literature which suggested 5s. per ton as the increase of cost under this Bill he began to wonder if they really believed that any increase would take place under the Bill at all. What chance was there of any increase? There was the same chance now as there was twenty years ago when they supported this measure—the same chance that there was four years ago when hon. Gentlemen opposite and their friends supported this measure. Another question was, did the increase in cost mean increase at the pit's mouth, or increase to the consumer? There were other persons interested in the production of coal who could pay these few pence and prevent their coming upon the consumer. The cost of production to the consumer depended upon many things, as they knew, besides the hours worked by the men. But quite apart from the question of the increase in the price of coal, he believed the conscience of the country had revolted against putting men of the very best type that the country produced to work for unreasonable hours of labour, and if there was a slight rise in the cost of production he believed the great bulk of the people of the country would be prepared to meet it. Although hon. Members on the other side of the House said that if the miners got their way in this Bill the cost of coal would be increased, it was a significant fact that all organised labour and its representatives in the House were unanimous in supporting the measure. Was it likely that hon. Members representing the Labour interest if they thought there was any danger of an increase in the price of coal would stand side by side with the miners in pressing this Bill on the House. He did not want to dwell at that moment on the proposed Government Amendment to the Bill. The question (if this was a good Bill) whether it should be postponed, and, if so, for how long, would be settled in Committee. The tests put before them by the right hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, in the beginning of this debate had been satisfied again and again. Their own knowledge of physical conditions must tell them that the effect of this Bill would make for the health of the miners over the whole country. So far as the test of whether it was to the public advantage was concerned, what proof had they got that there would be a rise of a 1s. or 9d., let alone 5s., in the cost of production? It was merely assertion, without proof, and it would be proved if it could be. The assertion was made merely to turn to account a political situation. There were no figures to support it, and that being so he respectfully asked the House to support the Bill on behalf of his constituency, which was unanimously in favour of it, and not to be led away by any idea that there would be a great increase in the cost of production when they found in the world of organised labour men of every interest in every trade standing together unanimously in its favour.

*SIR CHARLES McLAREN (Leicestershire, Bosworth) said there was one thing to be decided when they came to vote on the Second Reading of this Bill. A claim was put forward and had been put forward for more than twenty years by the whole body of miners of Great Britain, a body of men whose labour extended over every part of the country, who belonged to every race in these Islands, and who were not only among the hardest worked, but among the most intelligent of our industrial classes. They were banded together in the greatest and the wealthiest trade union of the world; they were represented in the House and also elsewhere by leaders of the greatest intelligence and knowledge of business affairs. These men had come forward and made this demand to Parliament to reduce their working hours to eight a day. They had taken that step every year for years after due deliberation in their unions and after consultation with their friends in the trade on both sides of the House. It was impossible to suppose that this great claim, put forward as it had been, could be brushed aside by mere technicalities, much less by such figures as were recently put before the House. For twenty years he had voted for this Bill, being largely interested in colliery properties, and every year that he had voted in favour of the Bill he had felt more and more justified in doing so, because although twenty years ago the conditions of the coal trade might have made the Bill a doubtful measure, he had never regarded it as one really dangerous to the industry. Twenty years ago the price of coal was very low, and old pits were being worked, but since those days things had changed. There was a very largely increased demand for coal, and there was a much higher price; there were better profits for all the owners and much better wages and conditions of work for the miners. What was more important still was that we had now a large number of new and admirably equipped collieries, and a large number of new shafts were now being sunk, and to these modern collieries this Bill would be no objection whatever. It was not the colliery in which the coal was worked within a short distance of the shaft that would suffer from an eight hours day; it was the old collieries in which the coal was far from the shaft and which were disappearing which would suffer. Now they had to ask themselves: Were there any valid and wide-reaching arguments which could be brought forward to meet the demands of the mining population for this Bill? There had been only one Member directly connected with the coal and iron trade who had that day spoken against the Bill. It was the hon. Member for Birmingham, and he was very glad to see that he ignored the figures that had been recently circulated by the Mining Association of which he and others had a great right to complain. He had no hesitation in saying that those figures were entirely misleading. The figures put forward by his hon. friend the Member for the Mansfield Division he had no doubt were absolutely correct. In South Wales they would have an increased cost of 1s. if this Bill passed. He was very largely interested in South Wales coal and he was prepared to meet that increased cost without the slightest feeling of apprehension. Welsh coal was an article of first necessity not only in this country, but all over the world. People must have Welsh coal, and if they must have Welsh coal they must be prepared to pay the price. Hon. Members might be surprised, perhaps, when he told them that in these circumstances he did not see that any great misfortune would fall upon his shoulders, if he shared all the advantages which a Welsh colliery possessed with the men who worked in the pits. The men would get better conditions of labour, and it would not necessarily reduce the profits of the producer of the coal. If he got that shilling out of his foreign customer, he did not see why he should not cheerfully support the Bill. He would point out that Welsh coal was not a house coal at all, except for the immediate locality. If they went to the Midland collieries, the circumstances were different. There were a good many collieries in the Midlands to which the passing of the Bill would make a difference of about 2½d. per ton. In others it would make a difference of 3d., 4d., 5d., or 6d. In considerable groups of collieries in North Derbyshire or South Yorkshire they might suffer to the extent of more than 6d. a ton, but the average in any group they might take would certainly not be more than 6d. The question of the market price of coal had been referred to. Every year the market price of coal rose or fell from totally different causes. Every advance of miners' wages of 10 per cent. meant a rise in the price of coal of 4d. or 6d. Every year London coal merchants put up the price of coal by 1s. to their customers in winter and nobody complained; and while they were willing to raise miners' wages, and allow even market fluctuations which in South Wales sometimes meant between 4s. and 5s. a ton, yet they had all this outcry and these exaggerated figures because the mining population of the country demanded a measure which would, perhaps, put up the price of house coal by 4d. or 6d. a ton. If hon. Members worked out the difference in price to the working classes they would find that it practically was not more than about one-eighth of a penny on a cwt., and that meant that if a man consumed a ton of coal every two months it would make a difference at the end of the year of 3s., or just about the price of a bottle of whisky. How could anybody come and say that that was a hardship on the consumer? This was one of those questions which the more they looked into it the less alarming it seemed. Everyone of his Conservative opponents for the last twenty years had been in favour of this Bill and, like himself, he was perfectly certain they had none of the alarm which had been expressed by hon. Gentlemen opposite, alarm which could not be founded, he thought, on serious conviction. He thought the statements they had heard were intended for the elections. It was necessary to make a little fuss in the House in order to justify the speeches which would be made at the elections. But he would be very much surprised if any considerable majority of the Conservative Party whom they found in the House would go into the lobby to vote against the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich): I have rarely listened to a more interesting speech than that which has just been made. It covered really a remarkable extent of ground. The hon. Member began by stating that 1s. or 1s. 6d. on a ton of Welsh coal would make no difference, because the foreigner will pay it. He went on to point out in language that we have heard before, and in a kind of detail we have heard before from those benches, at one time applied to the 4-lb. loaf, what an infinitesimal amount this would add to the cost paid by the workman for his coal. Then the hon. Member said I am quite prepared to pay this 1s. or 1s. 6d. on the price of coal but the hon. Gentleman does not belong to either of the classes which have been referred to in this House—either that large number who are on the verge of starvation, or that still larger number who have a constant struggle to prevent themselves falling below that verge. Turning from the speech of the hon. Member, I may say that I was not surprised that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wisbech should have said that after listening most carefully he had come to the conclusion that the whole weight of the argument was against the Government he desired to support. The only surprise I feel, since he has become so candid, is that he did not go further and say that no argument at all had been put before the House on the other side. I do not think that is an exaggeration. Take, for instance, the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary to the Home Office. Nobody recognises better than I do that the hon. Gentleman is quite capable of making a speech if he has a reasonable case. What did his speech consist of? Two things. First of all an attack, and a very strong attack, upon us for our inconsistency. What does that amount to? It simply amounts to this, that so long as this was a question to be debated on a Friday afternoon it was an open question on both sides of the House. It was nothing more than that. In my own case, for instance, and I think it is typical, I was interested in the subject, and I listened to many of those speeches which were made, but I doubt very much whether they stated the case for the Bill. My own opinions were clearly expressed, for my constituents constantly asked me questions, and I had to give the answers. The charge has been made that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition at that time, when he had the responsibility of office, did not come on a Friday afternoon. But it was the one day of the week when it was possible for him to obtain freedom, and he did not need to come and vote on this question, which at that time was purely academic. The hon. Gentleman's lecture on consistency had no doubt a great moral effect, but I think its moral effect cannot be greatly enhanced by the fact, as he informed us, that the debate is to be wound up for the Government by the right hon. Gentleman, who is the greatest exponent of the virtue of consistency to be found in the present House of Commons. Now, the next argument of the hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary for the Home Office was, I think, a far more reprehensible one, if I may say so. He wound up his speech by saying: "Your policy is a strike: our policy is this Bill." What does that mean? It means that the Government must not oppose this Bill because the coal trade threatens a strike. What a lesson that is to other trades! What will the railway men think of it, for we know that they think their hours too long? If we are to grant a Bill like this to one trade, for the reason that a strike is threatened, why in the world are you not to grant it to all trades? There is something more to be said on that point. Is the Government not greatly increasing the risk of strikes by passing this Bill? At all events the members of the Committee to which reference has been made so often take that view; they point out over and over again that controversies are sure to arise in consequence of this Bill, and they speak of the great danger which might occur in the country if those controversies were not met in the most conciliatory spirit on the part of masters and men. Take the position of the Northumberland and Durham miners. These men have been told that the Eight Hours Bill means a maximum of eight hours a day. But they work six and a half hours. The moment this Bill is passed, even in its amended form, the whole system of the Durham and Northumberland miners will break down, and it will have to be re-constituted, and those who have examined the question say that they see no way in which it can be re-arranged except by increasing the hours of the men who are now only working six and a half hours. Even with the best intentions, that represents a real difficulty—a difficulty which causes danger of a strike far more than the refusal of this House to pass the Second Reading of this Bill can possibly do. I should like to look more closely at the whole aspect of this question. So far everyone who has spoken in favour of the Bill, not excluding even the Home Secretary, has confined himself to one part of the question, namely, the humanity of the principles of the measure. That is a strong ground, but after all the history of the case is not so simple as that. We have the fact, for instance, mentioned by an hon. Member on the other side of the House, of men, I presume his constituents, who are working nearly 50 per cent. longer hours than the miners and for less than half the wages. That fact surely suggests at least the possibility that humanity may be on the other side of this question. If, therefore, this appeal to humanity is to be justified at all it must be justified on a more definite ground than that. It appears to me that the House of Commons would not be justified in passing this Bill until it has seriously considered the two points which seem to me essential for its proper understanding. The first of these points is whether or not the hours worked by the miners are so excessive as to demand at all costs immediate redress at the hands of this House. The second point is equally important. It is that whatever the House does it should do it with its eyes open, and after it has most carefully considered what the effect of this Bill will be upon all other classes of the country. Take the first point. Are the hours so excessive as to justify the treatment of a trade in a way that it has not been suggested at present that any other trade should be treated? We should expect, if such a case were to be made out, that it would be made out on the ground that the hours worked were such as to have so bad an effect on the health of the men that Parliament was bound to interfere. No such case has been made out. That point was definitely referred to the Committee. The Committee in their Report—and they gave the evidence on which their Report was founded—said unanimously that in their opinion there was no justification for the Bill on the ground of health. The Home Secretary, it is true, did not accept that finding of the Committee. Another hon. Gentleman, who spoke from below the gangway, rejected it on grounds which seem to me rather peculiar. He said that our common sense would tell us that nobody would like to be more than eight hours under ground. But one would not like to be a labourer engaged in steel works, or a labourer engaged in other trades, where they have to work under much worse conditions than those under which miners work, and where the men are less able to help themselves. But the Home Secretary has not accepted this finding of the Committee. He suggested that we should accept his opinion, but he gave no grounds for our so doing. He gave an argument which was knocked to pieces by my hon. friend behind me this afternoon, and which I need not therefore further refer to now. But perhaps it may be said that, though this trade is not an unhealthy trade, it is a dangerous trade. That is perfectly true. Everyone admits it, and if it could be said that this Bill decreased the dangers of that trade, it would be a far stronger argument in its favour than any which has been adduced so far, but that is not even pretended. The Committee report that there is no evidence whatever that the hours have anything whatever to do with the accidents, and they report also that unless the gravest precautions are taken, this Bill itself will increase the danger. More than that, the hon. Gentleman who was the Chairman of that Committee, in an interesting speech which he addressed to the House last week, told us that these precautions had not been sufficiently taken in the Bill. Therefore he is of opinion that the Bill as it stands is going to increase, and not diminish, the dangers of the miner's occupation. But it may be said that this trade, although its defence is not justifiable on the ground either of danger or of health, is so hard a trade that on that ground Parliament is justified in interfering. I am not concerned with denying that it is a hard life. I should not like to lead it myself. I do not deny that. I have heard its hardships described in this debate and in previous debates in very lurid language. I remember also hearing hon. Members who had themselves worked in coal mines both as boys and as men, scoff at these pictures, and declared that they were entirel exaggerated and no true pictures of the miner's life. I admit that it is a hard life, but there are many other lives which are more hard and more unhealthy. For instance, without going into it, labourers in the steel and iron trades have a far harder life from every point of view than the miner, and yet the benefit to the miners is going to be an added injury and an added burden to other men who have a greater claim upon our consideration. I really do not wish to exaggerate this case in the least. I admit that the hours worked in some districts are far longer than I should like to see them if they could be altered. I quite admit that. There is no need of exaggeration there. But let the House remember that in those districts where the daily hours are longest, the pits never work six days a week. As a rule, I think they work five days a week, and in no case more than eleven days in a fortnight. Therefore, if you take the miner's hours as the hours of other workmen are taken, at the amount per week, they are not nearly so excessive as they seem when you take them by the day. But there is something else to be remembered in this connection. Miners by the nature of their occupation can take a voluntary holiday much more easily than men in other trades, and they do take that voluntary holiday. Is there not a great deal to be said from the miner's point of view for that method? Let the House remember that the miner in getting to and from his work has to spend a good deal of profitless time, not only time spent in being wound up and down the shaft, but in many cases time spent in walking under difficult conditions for a great distance, sometimes four miles. Surely, it is reasonable to say that a miner under such conditions would himself prefer if his wages depend on the amount of coal he turns out, when he was once at the coal face, to work as long as he safely could, and take an occasional holiday, rather than have all that useless labour every day, and work shorter hours per day. I hope I have said enough to show that no case whatever has been made out for the hours of miners, in comparison with those of other trades—and that is the real point—being so excessive as to demand immediate redress by this House. But even if it were proved, and proved up to the hilt, that the hours ought to be lessened, even then the promoters of this Bill would not have made out their case. They would not have begun to make out their case until they proved that there was no reasonable prospect of better conditions being arrived at by the ordinary method of negotiations between masters and men. I remember some years ago the hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Durham said—

> "In view of the opportunity which workmen now have for combination, this Bill is a plea of cowardice. They are forgetful of their self-reliance in beseeching the House of Commons to do what, if the exigencies of trade will allow, they could do for themselves."

These words, it seems to me, are not only a sound view of this subject, but they are noteworthy also because they represent a radical difference between the new and the old trade unionism. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary was asked at one of the deputations—and I will say he was very good for receiving deputations from all classes of the community on the subject—why not leave this to be settled in the way that other trades do? He gave this answer. It was impossible, he said, because of the immense variety of the methods of working of miners in different parts of the country. Now I ask the House of Commons, is it possible to find any words which more strongly condemn the Bill? These differences are not accidental. They are not arbitrary. They are due to real differences of circumstances, and could anything be more foolish than for a Minister and a Government which realise what the differences are, to attempt to stereotype the trade of the whole country with all these differences in one cast-iron mould? Everyone knows—it has been admitted by the last speaker in favour of the Bill—that there is no organised body of men which is more powerful—there is, I think, not one which is so powerful—than the miners. Their power is recognised in every direction, and it is certainly only putting it very mildly to say they are at least better able than the men in any other trade to procure for themselves the best conditions of labour which the circumstances of that trade admit. That is a fact. It is not surprising that the miners' representatives, in spite of that fact, should ask the House to press the Bill, but I must say it needs some explanation why other Labour Members who represent other branches of industry, should support the miners on the Bill. The hon. Gentleman who spoke last said that the fact that they do so press it is a proof that it is not going to injure other trades. That is a very simple answer to make. Every one knows that these Gentlemen support this miners' Bill as a first step in a general advance in the same direction. They know that of all branches of men's combinations, the miners is the most powerful, and has the greatest political influence. It is for that reason that they are pressing on this Bill. They are pressing it, not because the miners need it more, but because they need it less than any other trade in the country. If that is their object it seems to me that they are beginning at the wrong end. If that is their object, every consideration of economics and of common-sense will suggest that this trade, instead of being the first to be dealt with, ought to be the last, for it is the trade on which the prosperity of all our trades depends. I consider that the circumstances under which this Bill is introduced into the House now are only another illustration of an evil which is admitted by everyone. The evil consists in the division between responsibility and power. The responsibility for this Bill rests on that bench. The power behind it rests there, and, personally I cannot believe that if these hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, instead of merely urging something else upon somebody else, were themselves responsible for this Bill they would not give more consideration than they have done, that they would not realise more fully than they have done, what the effect of the Bill will be upon the other working classes throughout the country. This brings me to the consideration of what seems to be the second point that we ought to take into account. Supposing we pass this Bill, what will its effect be upon the country? In other words, what price will all other classes of the community have to pay in order to grant this boon to the mining population? That the Bill is going to raise prices is admitted. I am not quite sure whether it was admitted by the Home Secretary or not. He quoted apparently with approval the finding of the Committee that the Bill would have the effect of causing loss and embarrassment to the country, but afterwards he embarked on an argument supported by an array of figures which seemed, so far as I could follow him, designed to prove that it would have no effect upon prices. The present Government is never so interesting, at least it is never so interesting to me, as when it is engaged in economic speculation. In that field they are supreme. The Prime Minister, who I am sorry is not present this afternoon, of course is easily first. During the short time that he was at the Exchequer he evolved a system of economics which, for its originality, its flexibility, and above all, its convenience, will excite the admiration and envy of all subsequent holders of that office. But the Prime Minister will have to look to his laurels. He has a rival now in the Home Secretary. The Home Secretary dealt with the strike of 1893. He gave us the average figure of prices to show that in spite of that strike, the price was lower in 1893, the year of the strike, than in the previous year, and that it was lower again in 1894 than in 1893. Then he turned to the other side. He went to the strike in South Wales of 1898 and showed that there, unlike 1893, the price was higher in 1898 than in 1897, and higher again in 1899 and 1900 than in 1898. Then he drew his conclusion, which is really so remarkable, that I should like to read the actual words—

> "So that at any rate for what it is worth, the average scale of prices does not seem to connect the sudden withdrawal of a large mass of coal with a sudden rise in price."

"For what it is worth." I suppose he thought it was worth something, or he would not have quoted it. For what it is worth the figures and the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman lead to a conclusion which is certainly original, the conclusion, namely, that there is no connection between the relation of supply and demand and prices. That certainly is the only meaning that I can draw from his words, after considering them very carefully. I am not quite sure whether the right hon. Gentleman does think there would be a rise. But after all his opinion—the opinion of any member of the Government—is not so important as that of the actual promoters of the Bill, the miner's representatives, for it is on the action of the miners that the extent or effect of this Bill will depend. The hon. Member for the Ince Division admitted quite frankly that the Bill would cause some increase in the price of coal. In a speech which the hon. Member delivered to a great meeting of miners in Manchester, which has already been referred to by my hon. friend, the hon. Member for the Ince Division told the miners that the effect of this Bill would be to add 6d. a ton to the price of coal on account of wages alone. It is obvious that if there is a rise on account of wages alone, there must, of course, be a rise due to other causes, as well. I know that what is said to the miners by hon. Members is much more important than what they say in this House, for this reason, that it shows what the miners expect as a consequence of the passing of this Bill. It is true that the hon. Member afterwards explained the matter, and said that he had left out of account the effect of co-operation between the masters and the men. I do not know what the hon. Member meant by that. If he meant that there was going to be a great increase in the output per hour, then I challenge him to go down to his constituents and say to the men that the effect will be that the moment this Bill is passed their wages per day will be reduced exactly corresponding to the shorter hours of work. Then I would like the hon. Member to turn to the men paid by results, and say to them: "Your wages will be reduced in the same proportion unless you turn out the same amount of coal in a shorter time." I think after making those statements to the miners the unanimity of which they now boast would very quickly disappear. But, an hon. Member, the Member for Glamorgan, incidentally used an argument to the effect that there would be no rise in the price because there would be no diminution in production. He said that the miners are paid by results, and their wages must be reduced unless they turn out the same quantity of coal in the shorter hours as they do now in the longer hours. Incidentally the hon. Member for Glamorgan claimed a certain amount of the virtue associated with the name of George Washington; but history does not relate that when George Washington became a politician he always found it possible to tell the whole truth. The hon. Member did not tell us another fact which is very material to the situation, namely, that for every sixpence added to the price of coal the miners receive an increase of 5 per cent. There were two methods by which it was suggested the miners would not suffer. One was by working harder and turning out more work in the same time; and the other was by working at the same rate and having higher prices for coal. If I had to choose I should certainly prefer the easier way, and so would the miner. We have all heard the story about the terrible evils which are going to happen from the shortening of hours. I am old enough myself to have seen many instances where the most exaggerated statements were made as to results which never happened. It is not always safe to be sure, and that is the only argument we have heard on this point. I wish, however, to point out that there is a very clear and marked distinction between shortening the hours of labour in an ordinary factory by agreement and shortening the hours of labour of coal-miners by Act of Parliament. I wish hon. Gentlemen opposite would seriously consider that point. Where the hours are shortened in a factory the men know that, if they agree to those shorter hours when they are paid by the piece, their only chance of making the same wages is by turning out more work. But that is not the case with the miners. Coal-mining is distinctly a monopoly, for if masters and men in the coal-mining industry combined, they could rule all the other industries. It is a monopoly for this reason also, that whereas the workers in all other trades have only one method of keeping up their wages, which is by turning out more work, the miners have a second method which has been preferred by the miners in the past, and it is the method of keeping up prices by diminishng the output of coal. Now, who are the promoters of this Bill? Its promoters are the Miners' Federation, and, as my hon. friend has already pointed out, one of the objects openly and avowedly expressed in the rules of the Federation is to prevent the adoption of the double shift wherever it is possible to do so. Under these circumstances is it not absurd, and is it not playing with the House of Commons, to come down here and say that they will do all they can to increase the production of coal?

MR. GLOVER (St. Helens): What the hon. Gentleman has read is not contained in the object of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain.

MR. BONAR LAW: No, but it is one of the objects of the Miners' Federation of South Wales. Is that not enough? I think I am right in saying that in the long run the interests of the miners will not be served by artificially raising the price of coal and diminishing the supply. Now, what use is this fact to us in estimating the effect of this Bill? We have to consider not what certain representatives think on this subject, but what the majority of the miners think. I am going to use what is not a very pleasant argument, but I use it with all respect. It is that I do not think we could get a better proof of the truth of this fact than that which has been supplied by the debates on this subject. In previous debates some of the very best speeches against this Bill were made by miners' representatives. They are still here, but they are not making speeches on this subject to-night. Does anyone suggest that they have changed their minds? [AN HON. MEMBER: Not at all.] No, but they have got to obey what has been ordered by the majority of their Federation; and in the same way it is the majority of the miners who will control the output of coal. I do not think that I am in any way exaggerating when I say that the majority of the miners of the country look upon this Bill as a means of getting a larger amount of wages for a smaller amount of work. The Committee, to which reference has so frequently been made, admit that there would be a disastrous rise in price but for some mitigation to which they make reference. I would like to go into the whole subject, but I do not want to weary the House and I will simply refer to one or two points. Those who formed the Committee said that they migh look for some mitigation of this diminution of supply in the greater efficiency of the men working shorter hours. That does not seem unreasonable on the face of it, but it should be remembered that the hours given in the Returns are not the hours which the men are actually working now. As a matter of fact, you have to deduct the time taken going up and down the shaft and the walk to the working place, which often takes as much as an hour each way. I agree that that is work, but it is a different kind of work from what is known as coal hewing. I agree that that kind of work does not tire the muscles and exhaust the men in the same way as coal hewing does. When the men are once down the pit and have gone through this superfluous labour of getting to the face of the coal, then it is in their own interest to turn out every ton of coal they possibly can. When you remember that fact I do not think it is wise to expect that there will be any great increase of efficiency in the work of the men. But we have experience to guide us on this point, and a little experience is worth any amount of speculation. In Lanarkshire, where the coal of Scotland is produced, an eight-hours winding day was introduced in the year 1900. I have had prepared these figures of the output per man in the Lanarkshire mines for the period before and since this change was made. I do not think it would be fair to take a single year on either side, and so I have taken an average number of years, and this is the result. From the year 1897 to the year 1899, the output of coal per man averaged 469 tons; in 1903–5 the output was 416 tons, and these are the last years for which returns are available. In the last years the falling off in the output is slightly greater taking percentages, than the falling off in the time limit, namely, one hour. But that does not represent the whole of the case. Under the eight-hours day in Lanarkshire, if half an hour is lost the men make it up by working the full time; so that under this Bill the falling off per man may be expected to exceed what happens under the voluntary arrangement now in force in Lanarkshire. The only other mitigating circumstance relied upon by the Committee is that there would be a great improvement, for which there was room, in coal-getting appliances. I think that is a very doubtful result. The House has to remember that it is just as much to the interest of every coal owner now to turn out as much as he can, and if he does not use the best machinery now what guarantee does the Bill give that he will be any wiser in the future than he has been in the past? It has already been pointed out that coal-cutting machinery cannot be economically used where there is a rigid day. The Committee point this out and give reasons for it. If, therefore, you establish a rigid day without making any variation in the case of those mines using coal-cutting machinery, that machinery cannot be used. As a matter of fact, no such mitigation is made in this Bill as it stands to deal with the question of coal-cutting. There are old collieries where it would not pay to expend new capital, and in the case of these old collieries, unless they work double shifts, they must go out of the market. Later on the Committee point out that the difficulties of having double shifts are insurmountable. That is the position of these old collieries, and this Bill is going to throw them out of operation. Is that not a serious thing? There are a number of old collieries which may not be taken entirely out of the market, but the Bill would not only remove that means of production and competition, but it would have a great effect on the amount which the consumer would have to pay. I am not going to speculate as to the amount of the rise. It is no doubt the fact that had this Bill been in operation a few months ago the price would have been more than doubled. What are the real facts of the case? The extent of the rise in price does not depend at all on any arithmetical relation to the cause which produces the rise. Take for instance what happened in 1899. The price of coal rose in a few months as much as 70 per cent. What caused that? It was simply because the demand rose very quickly. Everyone who needed coal began to be afraid that there was going to be a shortage, and they all competed with one another and the price rose out of all proportion to the additional cost. The same thing will always happen where there is an increase in the demand. I do not put any figure on it, but I say that anyone who scoffs at the possibility of the demand increasing more quickly than the supply and of a great rise in the price of coal out of all proportion to the additional cost knows very little about the matter. If it is admitted that there is to be a rise in price, it is no answer to claim that it is not going to be a big rise. I ask the House to consider what even a small rise would mean. It would mean that every family in this country—every working man in this country—and a great majority of them, remember, are worse off financially than before—would have to pay more for his coal. That would be the direct effect on the domestic consumer; but the indirect effect on the working class would be greater, for it would mean dearer coal for all our industries. That matter has been elaborately discussed in the Report of the Committee, and I am not going over the same ground now. There is no one engaged in the trade of this country or who has ever been engaged in it, who does not realise that the price of coal lies at the root of the prosperity of all our manufacturing industries. I would like to say something of the trade I am familiar with. Look at the effect which a slight rise in the price of coal has on the iron and steel trade. Iron furnaces have been built where coal and iron are found together. The iron trade now in this country rests exclusively upon a basis of cheap coal. Many iron-works were noted in districts where coal was obtainable, and now they have gone under. Iron-works must be near coal pits if they are to have any chance of surviving in the struggle of competition. If the House would realise that will be an increase in the price of coal, whatever it is—6d. 1s. or 2s. per ton—and what the effect of multiplying that four times would mean, they would understand what it means to the makers when they come to sell finished iron and steel. The iron and steel trade is one of those trades where competition now is keenest, not only in the neutral markets, but in our own home market. When you realise that, no man would be rash enough to say that the passing of this Bill may not have a most serious effect on the iron and steel trades of the country. The hon. Member for the Ince division suggested that we on this side of the House are so vigorously opposed to this Bill simply because we were going about hunting for an election cry, and that at last we have found it in the cry "dearer coal." Well, I do not think that remark will have much meaning now. It would have had some meaning two years ago. Now it is very evident that the Gentlemen who sit on the Treasury bench are doing our work for us. We have really no need to go out of our way to forge weapons. They have been constantly forging weapons in greater number and efficacy, and with a greater amount of labour than we could have forged for ourselves. There is not much point in the remark of the hon. Member, but it was interesting and well worth noting for another reason. It shows that the hon. Member realises now that this proposal is not popular in the country, that it is something with which to go to the constituencies. That is a consideration to which, to do them justice, His Majesty's Ministers never turn a deaf ear, and I am bound to say that I hope and believe that the effect of it will be found in the subsequent fate of this Bill.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. CHURCHILL, Dundee): The hon. Gentleman who has just spoken has addressed the House in a carefully reasoned, closely connected, argument, and I feel sure that the House will accord to me a generous measure of indulgence while I endeavour to state generally the main reasons why the Government commend this measure to the support of the House of Commons. The hon. Gentleman in the course of his speech made many complaints against this Bill, and indicated many evil consequences that he thought would flow from it, but, at any rate, whatever may be said against the measure, no one can say that the Government have acted with precipitation in bringing it before the House and the country. It has been debated for twenty years. Parliaments, Tory and Liberal, have affirmed the principle, and I do not suppose there ever was a similar reform put forward in this House upon a greater volume of scientific and accurate information, or after more prolonged, careful, and sustained scrutiny. If the debate on the Second Reading has thrown very little new light on this question, it is because it has been fully and thoroughly explored on former occasions, and not only has it been fully explored, but it is now illuminated by the admirable Report which has been presented by the Departmental Committee appointed last session. Whatever opinions we may hold on this Bill, I should suppose that the whole House would join in expressing its admiration of that document. Its comprehensive and lucid arguments, the moderation of its tone, the judicial, yet practical temper in which it is conceived, places us under deep gratitude to the hon. Member for Gloucester, and others who have collaborated with him in that work. This Report, while exciting approval on all sides, gives no complete satisfaction to any. It balances, and weighs, but it does not finally pronounce. It seeks less at deciding this controversy than at defining the limits within which its economic aspect may be said to lie. I think anyone who reads the Report with attention will feel after careful study that the limits of the economic controversy are moderately restricted. We have to consider on the one hand the gross reduction of one-tenth in the hours of labour of underground workmen, taking the average over all classes of men and all sorts of mines. And on the other hand we have as a set off against that gross reduction certain very important mitigations which are enumerated in the Report, to which I shall very briefly refer. The first economic question which the House has to settle is whether these mitigations which are enumerated will have the effect of overtaking the reduction which is to follow the curtailment of hours, or, if not, how far they will fall short in overtaking that reduction. I do not suppose that any hon. Gentleman is likely to change his opinion on a question of such complexity at this late hour of the debate, and, therefore, I shall only refer by name to these mitigations, bearing in mind how important they are. There are those which depend on the arrangements of employers, and those which depend on the volition of the workers. With regard to the employers there is improved organisation, by methods of haulage and winding, and other means specified in the Report. There is the more extensive application of coal-cutting machinery, and the sinking of new pits with modern appliances, which is progressing in many parts of the country. There is the system of double and multiple shifts. The extension of the system will not be so difficult as has sometimes been supposed. At the present moment, taking the statistics of 1906, a quarter only of the workers below ground are employed in mines in which there is only one coal-getting shift, and in all the mines in which there are two or more coal-getting shifts the first shift preponderates in number greatly over the second, and, therefore, in applying this system of double or multiple shifts, in so far as it is necessary to apply it, we shall not have to face the difficulty of a complete transformation in the methods of working a great many of the mines, but it will be a mere extension of the system which at present exists over a great portion of the coal-getting area. From the side of labour mitigations which may be expected as off-sets to the original reduction are not less important. There is the increased efficiency of which we have instances actually on record in this Report which has followed from the reduction of hours. There is the power of the worker, if he chooses, to increase his earnings on a short day; there is the field of absenteeism, which has always been felt as a reduction of hours, and which amounts to 6·6 per cent. of the working time of the mines, and there is the margin of stoppages through slack trade and other circumstances which at present aggregates 7 per cent. of the working time of the mines. Taking these last two alone, they aggregate 13 per cent. or considerably more as a margin than the reduction of working time which will be caused by the operation of this Bill, even when the full operation be effected. I say first of all then, let the House consider carefully whether from these sources it is possible to overtake the 10 per cent. reduction which, in the first instance, the Bill imposes. It is a question nicely balanced; it offers matter for fair argument this way and that, but taking all the considerations and means of mitigation singly and collectively and their action one on the other, it is surely very difficult to believe that masters and men, organised as they are and working together with good will, and with ample time to accommodate themselves to new arrangements, will not be able from all sources to overtake the comparatively small reduction in hours the Bill will effect. I am inclined to an opinion favourable to the use which will be made of these margins, but even if we assume, and it would be fair and necessary to assume for the sake of the argument, that there will be a net reduction in consequence of the passage of this Bill in the output of coal, that reduction must be temporary and transient in its character. For fifty years there have been continuous changes in the conditions of coal-mining in this country. The hours have been reduced, the conditions of boy labour have been restricted, wages have been raised, compensation has been provided, and precautions against accidents have been multiplied. All these changes, the wisdom of which nobody disputes, from a purely and crudely economic standpoint may be said to militate against production. We have heard many prophecies, but what has been the result? What has been the history of the coal trade? There has been one steady, unbroken expanse of output during the last fifty years. In the period of ten years ending in 1874, 76,000,000 tons were produced, in the next ten years 112,000,000, in the next ten years 145,000,000, in the next ten years 172,000,000, and in the last period of ten years 214,000,000—a figure which has been greatly exceeded since, if the average be taken. If it be admitted that there may be a certain reduction in output as a consequence of this Bill, that reduction must be considered, not by itself, not in isolation, but in relation to the steady and persistent movement of coal production for the last fifty years. To me it seems certain that the small temporary restriction will be lost in the general tendency to expansion, just as the recoiling wave is lost in the advance of the tide. But these arguments are wholly vitiated if it could be shown that the restriction of hours was so violent in its character, so sudden in its application, so rigid in its methods as, not merely to cause a certain shrinkage in the volume of the output, but, if it were large enough, to upset the economy of the coal mining industry. In that case there would be not merely a curtailment which might be mitigated, but we should have injured and possibly crushed the industry; and it is at this point that it is proper for the House to consider the safeguards introduced by the Government into the Bill. These safeguards are of the greatest importance. There is the safeguard of overtime. Sixty hours a year are permitted in districts where men work ten days a fortnight, twelve weeks of time will be one hour longer than the time allowed by the Bill; and where the days laboured are only four in the week, fifteen weeks of full time will be provided out of the provision of overtime. There are provisions with regard to the labour of certain persons permitted to remain below ground and there is a power which relaxes the Bill fully in an emergency which is likely to delay or arrest the general work of the mine, and of course, in any case where there is accident or danger. Finally, if there should be a danger of a corner or an unexpected rise in price, the Government have power by Order in Council to suspend the whole operation of the law in order to prevent anything like a serious crisis arising in the coal trade. I cannot bring myself to believe that with all these safeguards it will not be possible for the coal industry, if given time, to accommodate itself to the new conditions. It was only two years ago that I was invited from these benches to contemplate the approaching ruin of the gold mines of the Rand through the change introduced in the methods of working. That change has been introduced, with the result that working expenses have been reduced, and the standard of improvement has increased. In making the transition, if time had not been allowed to me to tide over the period of change, then, indeed, you might have had that disaster which hon. Gentlemen opposite have always been ready to apprehend. There is here to be a gradual process of adaptation for which not less than five years is permitted. I was very much surprised that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square should have committed himself to the argument which, if it meant anything, meant that the great trade unions would have been doing a more manly thing if they had plunged the industries of the country into chaos and confusion by a general strike, than by coming moderately and patiently every year to demand this reform. The hon. Member for Brighton said that positive reasons, and not negative reasons, ought to be given in support of a measure which regulates the hours of adult labour—that you ought to show, not that it will do no harm, but that good will come from it. There are, of course, such reasons in support of this Bill, but they are so obvious that they have not been dwelt upon so much as they might have been. Those reasons are social reasons. We believe that the well-being of the mining population, numbering some 900,000 persons, will be sensibly advanced in respect of health, industrial efficiency, habits of temperance, education, culture, and the general habits of life. We have seen that in the past the shortening of hours has produced beneficial effects in these respects, and we know that in those parts of the country where the hours of coal-mining are shortest, the University extension lecturers find that the miners take an intelligent interest in their lectures—and it is among the miners of Fifeshire that a considerable development in gardening and of saving to enable them to own their own houses, has followed on a longer period of leisure. But the general march of industrial democracy is not towards inadequate hours of work but towards sufficient hours of leisure. That is the movement among the working people all over the country. They are not content that their lives should remain mere alternatives between the bed and the factory. They demand time to look about them, time to see their homes by daylight, to see their children, time to think and read and cultivate their gardens—time, in short, to live. That is very strange, perhaps, but that is the request they have made and are making with increasing force and reason as years pass by. No one is to be pitied for having to work hard, but nature has contrived a special reward for the man who works hard. It gives him an extra relish which enables him to gather a satisfaction in search of which the social idler wanders vainly through the twenty-four hours. This reward, so precious in itself, is snatched away from the man who has won it if the hours of his labour are too long or the conditions of his labour too severe to leave any time for him to enjoy the reward he has won. I have here a quotation from "Principles of Economics," by Professor Marshall, who recently resigned the professorship of Political Economy at Cambridge, which illustrates with great force the point I am submitting without which I contend we cannot make our support of the Bill complete. Professor Marshall says—

> "The influence which the standard of hours of work exerts on economic activities is partially obscured by the fact that the earnings of a human being are commonly counted gross; no special reckoning being made for his wear-and-tear, of which he is himself rather careless. Further, very little account is taken of the evil effects of the overwork of men on the well-being of the next generation. . . . When the hours and the general conditions of labour are such as to cause great wear-and-tear of body or mind or both, and to lead to a low standard of living; when there has been a want of that leisure, rest and repose, which are among the necessaries for efficiency, then the labour has been extravagant from the point of view of society at large. . . . And, since material wealth exists for the sake of man, and not man for the sake of material wealth, the replacement of inefficient and stunted human lives by more efficient and fuller lives would be a gain of a higher order than any temporary material loss that might have been occasioned on the way."

But it may be said that these arguments are general, and that special circumstances existed to differentiate the case of coal-miners from that of many other industries in this country. Others have spoken of the heat of the mine, the danger of firedamp, of the cramped position, of the muscular exertions of the miner, at work in galleries perhaps a mile under the ground. I select the single fact of deprivation of natural light. That alone is enough to justify Parliament in directing upon the industry of coal-mining a specially severe scrutiny and introducing regulations of a different character from those elsewhere. The hon. Member for Windsor, who moved the rejection of this Bill, described it as a reckless and foolhardy experiment. I see the miner emerging from the pit after eight hours' work with the assertion on his lips that he, at any rate, has paid his daily debt to his fellow men. Is the House of Commons now going to say to him, "You have no right to be here. You have only worked eight hours. Your appearance on the surface of the earth after eight hours' work is, to quote the hon. Member, a dangerous and foolhardy experiment?" Two hours more are demanded in the interest of economics. I do not wonder a bit at the miners' demand. I cannot find it in my heart to feel the slightest surprise, or indignation, or mental disturbance. My capacity for wonder is entirely absorbed, not by the miners' demand, but by the gentleman in the silk hat and white waistcoat who has the coolness, the calmness, the composure, and the complacency to deny that demand and dispute it with him. The hon. Member for Dulwich—himself a convinced protectionist, with a tariff with 1,200 articles in its schedules in his coat-tail pocket—has given us a delightful lecture on the importance of cheapness of production. Think of the poor consumer. Think of the importance to our industries of cheapness of production. We on this side are great admirers of cheapness of production. We have reminded the hon. Gentleman of it often; but why should cheapness of production always be achieved at the expense of the human factor? The hon. Gentleman spoke with anxiety of the possibility of a rise in miners' wages as a consequence of this Bill. Has he considered the relation of miners' wages to the selling prices of coal? At the pit's mouth the underground-workers' wages are only 60 per cent. of the selling price of coal. Free on board on the Tyne the proportion is only 38 per cent. As coal is sold here in the south of England the proportion is less than one-fifth of the whole price. Is it not clear that there are other factors at least which require consideration before you decide to deal with the human factor which first attracts the right hon. Gentleman? What about mining royalties? In all this talk about the importance of cheap coal to our industries and to the poor consumer we have had no mention of mining royalties. No. We never mention that.

That is never heard. Yet, will the House believe it, it is estimated that mining royalties impose a toll of 6 per cent., calculated on the price of coal at the pit's mouth, or considerably more than half the total diminished production which could result from this humane Act of labour legislation. The hon. Gentleman went further, and said: "Why stop here? Why don't your arguments apply elsewhere?" The Member for Cambridgeshire mentioned people whose conditions of life he thought worse than some of those of coalminers. Why stop here, we are asked. Who ever said we would stop here? I welcome and support this measure, not only for its own sake, but much more because it is, I believe, simply the precursor of the general movement which is in progress all over the world, and in other industries besides this, towards a reconciling of the conditions of labour with the well-ascertained laws of science and health. When we are told that because we support this measure we shall be inflicting an injury or injustice on other classes of the population, I say there is a great solidarity among all classes. I believe that when they consider this matter they will see that all legitimate interests are in harmony, that no one class can obtain permanent advantage by undue strain on another, and that in the end their turn will come for shorter hours, and will come the sooner because they have aided others to obtain that which they desire themselves. When the House is asked to contemplate gloomy pictures let them recur to the example of Parliaments gone by. When the Ten Hours Bill was introduced in 1847, a Bill which affected the hours of adult males inferentially, the same lugubrious prophecies were indulged in from both sides of the House. Distinguished economists came forward to prove that the whole profit of the textile industry was reaped after the eleventh hour. Famous statesmen on both sides spoke strongly against the measure. That Parliament, in 1847, was in the same sort of position as we are to-day in this respect, but how differently circumstanced in other respects. That Parliament did not enjoy the wide and accurate statistical information in every branch of labour which enables us to-day to move forward with discretion and prudence. They were not able to look to the general evidences of commercial security and expansion on which modern politicians can rely. They could not show as we can show, overwhelming examples of owlish prophecies directly disproved; they could not point as we can point to scores of cases where not only increased efficiency, but a positive increase in output has followed the reduction of the hours of labour. The principle was new, the future was vague. But Parliament in those days did not quail. They trusted the broad generous instincts of common sense; they drew a good, bold line; and we to-day enjoy in a more gentle, more humane, more skilful, more sober, and more civilised population the blessings which have followed their acts. Now it is our turn. Let us vote for the Second Reading of this Bill, and in so doing establish a claim for respect from Parliaments to come such as we owe to Parliaments of the past.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 390; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 166.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agar-Robartes, Hon. T. C. R.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire

Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies,M.Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H.(St.Pancras,N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Glover, Thomas

Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Ross'ndale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James (Alfred)
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E)
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington

Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim,N)
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton

Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H.(Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A H(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon.T.(Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk
Staveley-Hill, Henry(Staff'sh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, JWH(Somerset, E.)
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, G.R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R.(Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward, W.Dudley (South'mpt'n)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay, T.
Wason, RtHn E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, RtHn.Sir ThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams. Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williams, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St.Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, RtHn.Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.SirH.
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt.HnG(Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beck, A. Cecil
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn J.A.(Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cory, Sir Clliford John
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Criag, Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James(Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir FredDixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Dension(York)
Faber, Capt.W.V.(Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hope, James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, RtHn.Sir John H.
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir HenrySeymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H.(Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin, S)

Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, J. Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 113 ; Noes, 391. (Division List No. 167.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beck, A. Cecil
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J A. (Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Watt, Henry A.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair

Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Ch'shire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Compton-Rickett, Sir J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Suss'x, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert Jn.
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Rt Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N)
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, Hon. E. S.

Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond,JohnE.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H.(Denbighs)
Robertson,Sir G Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Grennock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker,Rt.Hn.SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) moved that the Bill be recommitted in respect of the schedule and in respect of the Amendments to paragraphs (i.) and (ii.) of the proviso in paragraph (*a*) of Clause 3, standing on the Notice Paper in his name as Amendments to be moved on recommittal. He said that he made this Motion as the result of a general demand made by all sections of the House. The sliding scale was moved from the other side of the House and finally the Government recommended its adoption, and it was carried by a very great majority. But a minority objected that it was not liberal enough, and pressed for an opportunity to discuss it, which the Government could not very well resist. The other points dealt with the medical relief clauses, and whether they included provision for food and necessaries in the case of childbirth. He assumed there would be no necessity for any prolonged discussion at any rate on those points.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of the Schedule and in respect of the Amendments to paragraphs (i.) and (ii.) of the proviso to paragraph (*a*) of Clause 3, standing on the Notice Paper in the name of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer as Amendments to be moved on recommittal."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

*MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) moved an Amendment asking that Clause 2 be recommitted together with the other provisions to which the Motion referred. Clause 2 contained one of the most vital provisions of the Bill, and it had had no discussion at all. It was most unreasonable to pass such a clause without any opportunity being allowed for proper debate upon it. The clause dealt with the question of age. The age could be raised above seventy even on Report, and while there might be some in the House who would desire to raise it from an economical point of view there would not be many of that opinion. But there would certainly be a very strong Party who would be disposed to reduce the age, and that they should not have an opportunity of discussing the point seemed to be highly undesirable. There was clearly neither in the House nor in the country any unanimity as to the age, and that constituted a ground for its consideration. There was also no question under the Bill of providing for infirmity, and as the age was fixed so very high that some of their friends in the country were telling them it was no good to them because it was only "five bob a week when they were dead," that also seemed a sufficient ground for giving the House an opportunity of really considering whether seventy was the right age.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the first word 'of,' to insert the words 'Clause 2 and.'"—(*Mr. Carlile.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he would not like to say it was not fair that they should be pressed at this stage, but, at any rate, he did not gather that the hon. Gentleman himself was in favour of reducing the age. At least he did not vote for it.

MR. CARLILE: I did not get a chance.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg his pardon. He did. A Vote was challenged on it by the Labour Members.

MR. CARLILE: That was against the whole clause.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was understood to be a challenge upon the age-limit and the hon. Member had not himself expressed an opinion in favour of reducing the age. They clearly could not recommit the Bill to raise a point of that kind.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said it was a pity the right hon. Gentleman could not show a little grace to the House and have the Bill recommitted in respect of Clause 2 which had never been discussed at all. It was true that Members below the gangway challenged a division on the whole clause, but though their intention might have been most excellent they never gave any information as to the particular grounds on which they were challenging a division. To say that his hon. friend had indirectly expressed an opinion about the age-limit because he did or did not vote in the division challenged by hon. Members below the gangway, who never explained the reason they were challenging it, appeared to be a quibble hardly worthy of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He did not mind telling him he himself would certainly not vote for the reduction of the age-limit. He quite agreed that the right hon. Gentleman had no money at all at his disposal to meet the increased cost that would be entailed, but they ought to have an opportunity of discovering what was the general opinion in the House itself about the age-limit. It was a very important part of the Government Bill, and if it was worth anything at all it surely was worth an hour or two's discussion in Committee. It was the duty of Members to try to find out what was the general feeling of the House upon the age-limit, and what demands were likely to be made in future upon the Exchequer as a result of the change which would undoubtedly be made. He thought if the opinion of the House was taken upon the age-limit, the right hon. Gentleman would find there were few Members who were satisfied with it. Many hon. Members were pledged to get the age-limit reduced below seventy, and therefore the Government ought to be prepared to pay not only all demands up to seventy years of age, but even up to the age of sixty-five if the country demanded it, and they should not have brought this Bill in at all unless they were prepared to find the money in years to come. There was another point which might have been brought up under this Clause, but which had not yet been touched upon. On the Second Reading they had a discussion upon the merits of a contributory scheme, but no discussion took place as to whether it would not have been possible for the State to give a sum of money to the various friendly societies in proportion to the amount held to the credit of their members. Men and women insured themselves in those societies against sickness and they had a certain sum placed to their credit, and at the age of sixty-five that sum was handed over to them. Surely it would have been possible to have assisted these societies by giving them some additional grant in proportion to the amount which the members had placed to their credit.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not think this question arises now.

Mr. Hicks Beach.

MR. HICKS BEACH submitted that if the clause had been dealt with at all it would have been possible to have dealt with that question. As no opportunity had been afforded them of raising that subject in the discussion he thought it was very desirable, from the point of view both of the Government and of the House at large, that the subject should be considered. Unless the Government intended to make the House of Lords undertake the Committee stages of all their Bills it was desirable that the Government should reconsider their decision in regard to the recommittal of this clause.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said the action of his hon. friend on this point was not only justifiable but inevitable. Why was the Motion to recommit the Bill made? They were told that it had been made in deference to the wishes of the Opposition and in consequence of the schedule not having been discussed. The real reason for recommitting the Bill was that the Government thought fit to move the closure by compartments Resolution before they had fully realised the main difficulties of the Bill, with the result that they had been obliged to abandon the fixed standard and adopt the sliding scale. Their own Resolution had operated so harshly upon themselves that the Government had found it impossible to listen to comments upon their new proposals. Therefore this Motion had been made to enable the House to discuss Government Amendments on the paper, and it was most improper to condemn the action of his hon. friend as unfair when that was the only opportunity they would have of raising the general question. It was the only opportunity of raising a debate on the question of the age-limit. He could not vote for a wholesale reduction of the age from seventy to sixty-five, but some opportunity ought to be afforded for stating the counter-proposition which, while not hostile to the Bill, would have lessened the burden on the State.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): That is not relevant on this clause.

MR. WALTER LONG said he was dealing for the moment with the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. A scheme had been discussed amongst friendly societies which had for its object that very result, namely, to establish by a dual system a pension for those who had attained a certain age. This was the clause upon which the subject could be raised, and the House was afforded an illustration in this case of the extraordinary hardship caused by the operation of the closure by compartments Motion, which had shut out many questions in which hon. Members in all quarters of the House were interested. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them that they had had a chance of voting for or against the age-limit of seventy. When a division was taken under the Closure upon the whole clause it did not rest with those on the opposite side to define the reason for action on the part of those in whose counsels they took no share. That division was against the clause as a whole, and they were thus prevented from advocating a middle course. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said they ought to have voted with those who were entirely opposed root and branch to the Government proposal, but surely that would have been an unreasonable attitude to take up. Personally, he could not vote for a reduction of the age-limit from seventy to sixty-five, because it would inflict a monstrous injustice upon the country. He ventured to say emphatically that the action of his hon. friend and the Opposition in asking for an opportunity to discuss this clause was a course of which the Government could not fairly complain.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said the right hon. Gentleman and his friends must make up their minds as to the best way of spending the limited amount of time at their disposal. [HON. MEMBERS: Why limited?] There was no intention of having a late sitting that night, and the Report stage came on to-morrow. The sole object of the Government in recommitting the Bill had been already explained. It was a matter of perfect indifference to them whether the Bill was recommitted or not. He thought it was well that that should be clearly understood. In regard to the particular Amendment, it was an extraordinary thing that its supporters disclaimed any desire to alter the age-limit.

MR. CARLILE denied that as far as he was concerned.

MR. ASQUITH said that perhaps he went too far; certainly they abstained from expressing any desire for alteration. As regarded the time spent in Committee that was determined by the House itself. It always happened under a closure Motion that some points necessarily were shut out from discussion, which many hon. Gentlemen would like to discuss, but that very often was not the fault of the closure Resolution, but the fault of the way in which the time allotted was occupied. What they were anxious that the House should have the opportunity of doing was going into the question of the scale—the scale which the Government accepted from the other side of the House after considerable discussion, in order that they might have a further opportunity in Committee of considering whether the various steps of that scale were in accordance with fairness and justice. He earnestly appealed to the House to use the time now before them mainly for that purpose.

MR. WALTER LONG said the Prime Minister had suggested that his action was unfair. He did not think that charge ought to have been made. Unless some such words as "hereinafter provided" had been introduced, it would have been impossible to make the changes in regard to which there were Amendments on the Paper.

MR. ASQUITH said he would withdraw what he said, if the right hon. Gentleman understood him to charge him with unfairness.

MR. CURRAN (Durham, Jarrow) said he was a new Member, and he did not understand the tactics of hon. Gentlemen above the gangway. It would be in the recollection of the House that his colleagues of the Labour Party challenged a division on the question of the age-limit. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who had spoken that day were in the same lobby with the Government. Did the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment want the age-limit to be raised? [Cries of "No."]

Mr. CARLILE said he expressed no opinion as to raising or lowering the limit. He hoped that the Prime Minister would not put words in his mouth.

Mr. CURRAN said he did not think there were many Members who would wish to increase the age-limit, although the hon. Member for St. Albans seemed to suggest that there were some. If another division could be obtained on the age-limit would hon. and right hon. Gentlemen above the gangway vote in favour of a reduction? [Cries of "No."] If not, what was the purpose of the Amendment? The Labour Party did not wish to waste the time of the House with useless Amendments.

Mr. GOULDING (Worcester) repudiated the statement that no objection was raised to the age-limit from that side of the House. He referred to that himself, and said that unless they recommitted the Bill in regard to that clause in order to have an opportunity of reducing the age-limit the Bill would be practically a dead letter in the towns.

Mr. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) said he had listened with amazement to the Prime Minister when he said the Government were perfectly indifferent whether the Bill were recommitted or not. Then the Prime Minister must be indifferent to the public opinion of the country, for the country wished this Bill to be properly discussed. He was amazed to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that it was impossible to raise the principle of the scheme on Clause 2. What was to prevent there being added to the third condition another—that the claimant for a pension should prove that he had made a contribution during so many years of his life towards the pension? However, he passed that point. Nor could he understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer's saying that it could not be raised on the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Preston. That hon. Member would have liked to raise it last week and probably would like to raise it yet. He was also amazed at the remarks of the Prime Minister, who said he was perfectly indifferent as to whether the Bill was recommitted or not and that he was indifferent to the public opinion of the country. The public opinion of the country was not indifferent. Public opinion wished to see the Bill thoroughly thrashed out, so that the interests of the aged poor should not be sacrificed.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he would support the Amendment. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had scarcely concealed his opinion that this was an unfair method of procedure. The Opposition had protested all along that the Bill had not been properly discussed, and the Government now, by their own action, gave them an opportunity of discussing it, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that it was very unfair of them to take advantage of that opportunity. He thought they would be grossly wanting in their duty to their constituents if they did not on that, and every other occasion, take the opportunity of showing how the business of the House was conducted under a Liberal Administration. The Prime Minister had done nothing except to show contempt for the Opposition. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Government did not intend anything to be discussed except the schedules and the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean; and that therefore any discussion was improper unless the Government wished it to be discussed. The Prime Minister when asked the other day about this Motion said that unless the House confined itself to the lines of discussion marked out for it, he would take care that there was no prolonged discussion. He protested against the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman that it was through the delay caused by the Opposition that the question had not been discussed. He did not believe that for a moment; and if the right hon. Gentleman had had an opportunity of listening to the debates he would not have made that suggestion. The hon.

Member for Jarrow, who had made a speech on similar lines, was a Socialist. He had always observed that the feeling of Socialists was closely allied to tyranny. The hon. Member's position was that whatever the Labour Party did not approve of should not be discussed at all. As to the merits of the Amendment, he did not believe that anyone denied that Clause 2 ought to be discussed in Committee; and as it had not been discussed in Committee it was thoroughly right and imperative that they should ask for and have a discussion on it. The important and vital question whether pensions should not be given for age alone, but also for infirmity, had not been discussed in Committee at all, and it ought to be discussed.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It was ruled out of order by the Chairman.

LORD R. CECIL: Certainly; because the hon. Member had not had an opportunity of raising the question at the proper moment. But there was another question on which the Opposition and the country required some explanation from the Government. The Government said that pensions were going to be given at seventy, but how were they to prove that the claimant was seventy years of age? Was the pension officer or the recipient to prove it? A man who had been only three or four years in a town might demand a pension because he was seventy years of age; but who was to prove it? Were they going to say to the claimant: "You must produce the registration of your birth before you can get a pension?" If that were the case, there were very few old people who would be able to produce a copy of their birth registration, even if they had money to pay for it. A very large proportion of the people of England were not registered at all. He thought the Compulsory Registration Act was only introduced about the year 1860. No suggestion had been made from any member of the majority opposite, who were living under servile conditions, as to how the age was to be proved. It was left for those on that side of the House to argue for the rights and liberties of the House of Commons. The suggestion of the Prime Minister had made all discussion impossible. He did not believe there would have been the least obstruction. This action of the Government was an attempt to drive into five days the discussion of a Bill which was the greatest departure in legislation on the condition of the poor since the Poor Law Act of 1834. He maintained that the way the Government had burked discussion in the House was grossly unjust.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said that the Prime Minister had missed the point which was in the minds of the Opposition. He thought that the honour and dignity of the House were being sacrificed by this rabid use of the closure. The most vital clause in the whole Bill was to be closured without a single word of discussion as to the age of the recipient of a pension. The whole thing was to be relegated to one did not know when. They were told that the fate of the Bill was hanging on a thread. In all probability new points would be discovered in this clause. Some hidden points always turned up in full and free discussion. In the Education Bill of 1870 they would not have had the Cowper-Temple Clause if discussion had been closured.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot discuss the closure at large; but only the Amendment before the House.

MR. MIDDLEMORE said he considered this clause the most important in the Bill and he thought that the procedure of the Government was a scandal.

SIR JOHN RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth) thought that it was almost unprecedented when a Motion was presented from the Opposition benches relating to one of the clauses of the most important Bill of the whole session, a Bill which was engaging the profound interest of the whole country, and when a Motion for the re-committal of the Bill was made, that the Prime Minister should get up in his place and tell the House that it was a matter of perfect indifference to the Government and that he did not care two straws what happened in the course of the debate. He did not think that the indifference of the Prime Minister would quite find the echo in the country which the right hon. Gentleman expected. If there was one thing which the country liked to see in the debates in the House it was that questions in which it took a profound interest were carefully and properly discussed. Such questions were those relating to the age at which pensions were to be distributed, whether at seventy or at an earlier period in the life of the recipient, or where the money was to be found for an extension of the age limit; and until these were made quite clear in the House of Commons there would be very great reason for dissatisfaction in the country. If these matters were fairly debated and shown to be impracticable or impossible he did not think that the Bill would be received with the gratitude the supporters of the Government anticipated.

*Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) said that they on the Opposition side of the House had a very strong opinion that the Prime Minister had not shown any fairness in the manner in which he was acting. There were some pathetic cases of men who were willing to work, and of men who could not find work, but one of the most pathetic figures in public life just now was the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had been loaded by his predecessor with this measure, and who had withheld from the House the information necessary for its discussion. They did not speak vainly. They knew of what they were speaking, and they knew that both the right hon. Gentlemen did, in fact, hold back the information to which the House was entitled——

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER asked what bearing this had on the question.

*Mr. R. DUNCAN said the real discussion on the particular clause which the Committee was now engaged in considering depended on the information they got from those who knew this subject from actual experience in life, the friendly societies, and that the Government withheld. The country was watching the right hon. Gentlemen, and the eye turned upon them was none too friendly. If they persisted in their present course what would be the result? It would be said that they were rushing into this matter without waiting for the Report of the Commission now investigating the Poor Law of the country, for the sake of getting votes at the next elections. That course would justly affect the treatment of this measure in another place.

*Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn), as one who represented a London constituency, and who had sat on a Committee with the present Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider the old-age pension scheme of the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Worcester, where the age-limit was sixty-five, appealed to the Prime Minister to allow this clause to be recommitted. If he were allowed to do so he could satisfy the House that at all events in London the situation was a very serious one. The age of seventy was practically of no use to the working classes of London. If the Bill was to be given a fair test, and everybody wished it to be, it ought, at all events, to have an old-age limit which would provide for the needs of our great industrial centres. Then again, who was going to prove the age of the applicants for these pensions? Were there to be pension agents such as were in existence in other countries with all the accompanying disadvantages of that detestable system? We were laying up for ourselves a great store of difficulties under subsection (2) of Section 2. That subsection applied with great force to London with its dock labourers constantly going abroad for periods short or long. They were men who worked hard, and were they to be precluded from the pension that Parliament was anxious to give them? Those two points alone as affecting London justified him in asking the Prime Minister to reconsider this, and therefore he asked him to allow the clause to be recommitted for the purpose of considering them. The right hon. Gentleman said that time was limited, but he had suspended the Eleven o'clock Rule which would give them time to debate upon two points. If the right hon. Gentleman said he was indifferent but that time was limited, it could only mean that he intended to closure discussion. If the right hon. Gentleman did that then he must take the responsibility of it in the country.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said he was not one of those who were prepared to lower the age-limit beyond that contained in the Bill; and he would not have risen in this discussion had it not been for the speeches of the two right hon. Gentlemen opposite. Each made it a complaint that a clause which was not discussed in Committee should be recommitted. He was one of those who not only did not divide against the clause, but was foolish enough to support the right hon. Gentleman and the Government in the division. He never thought the right hon. Gentleman would make that a complaint for not discussing the clause at some future time if an opportunity was given. He did not vote against the clause when hon. Gentlemen below the gangway challenged it, because there had been no opportunity for him or hon. Gentlemen below the gangway to say what they thought of it. He voted for the Government, but he was as anxious as anybody for a discussion as to whether, in accepting the Government Bill of a non-contributory scheme of a pension at the age of seventy, under certain conditions a contributory scheme should not be run supplementary to it with a pension beginning at an earlier age. There was one question particularly which he desired to raise on the clause, the question which the noble Lord the Member for Marylebone and others had raised, as to residence. They had had a little discussion on that matter on Clause 1, and they were then met, quite reasonably, by the Chancellor of the Exchequer with the statement that the proper place to raise that question was on Clause 2. He raised the question of the interpretation of Clause 2, as to whether it carried out the intention of the Government, and as to what the intentions of the Government were, and the right hon. Gentleman said he could not discuss the intentions of the Government as embodied in Clause 2 before that clause was reached. He waited for Clause 2 and waited in vain, and now when the necessities of the Government forced them to come to the House and recommit the Bill in certain respects, he certainly supported his hon. and gallant friend in his appeal that they should recommit it in regard to a clause that had not been discussed. When the Prime Minister said it was a matter of indifference to him whether the Bill was discussed or not, he could quite imagine it was. It was a matter of indifference to the right hon. Gentleman whether any Bill was discussed. So long as his majority was ready to register his decrees he was content. The Bill was not being recommitted because hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side wished to discuss it. The right hon. Gentleman would never recommit a Bill under those circumstances. It was recommitted because of the demand of Members behind the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing), who was received with cries of "Divide," said he welcomed the cries of "Divide," because it showed the position of the party opposite at the present time. It showed that the Opposition were not to be allowed to discuss a crucial portion of the Bill. They were to be shut out by that offensive weapon the guillotine which had been used by the party in power in a manner in which it had never been used before in Parliamentary history. The Unionist Party was to be dragooned into anything which the Prime Minister chose to place before them. From his point of view this clause was the most crucial part of the Bill. When the contributory scheme was rejected it only remained to him to do his duty by his constituency, a constituency of between 23,000 and 24,000 people a very large number of whom belonged to a class that never lived until seventy years of age. [MINISTERIAL Laughter.] He did not know whether the merriment of hon. Gentlemen opposite was caused by that fact or the fact that he represented them. It remained for him to do his duty by his constituents and to endeavour to make this a real measure, which it was not and could not be whilst seventy years remained the qualifying age for the pension. Either the Bill was intended to be a genuine one or it was not; much could be done to make it effective in such a division as he represented by the reduction of the age limit to sixty-five—for they could not put the London artisan on the same footing as the agricultural labourer when dealing with what was a fair pensionable age, for his work was such as to prevent equality of treatment. He (Mr. Nield) did not hesitate to describe the Bill as at present drawn as an electioneering device, flashed on to the electoral screen of the party opposite; but it would deceive nobody when the proceedings in Parliament in connection with it were appreciated in the country. Electioneering methods might well puzzle hon. Gentlemen opposite, and no doubt this was considered a desirable measure to dangle before the electors at the next election. If this scheme was to be regarded as an honest one, it should apply to those to whom it ought to apply. It might be very well to have seventy as the age-limit in the country. He wanted this question of the age to be discussed. They wanted to see whether the Bill was to be a real Bill, of benefit to the great mass of the industrial inhabitants of the suburbs of this great city, or whether it was to be a sham Bill. That was what they wanted discussed, and it was what had not been discussed yet because of the guillotine. [Cries of "Order."] Really, Mr. Deputy-Speaker had a truly remarkable number of auxiliaries to keep order. He entered his most emphatic protest against the conditions under which work was done in that House, and against the refusal to recommit the Bill in respect of so important a question as that of Clause 2.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) said there was a point he would like to raise, and which he had desired to present in the Committee stage of this Bill. He had put down an Amendment to Clause 2 for the purpose of confining the benefits of the Bill to British-born subjects. There was no one in that House or in the country who would not agree with him that the benefits of the Bill should be so limited. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, if they passed the Bill without discussion, British-born subjects were to be alone benefited by the measure. If the Bill were recommitted he had an Amendment down which would raise the question. They had not heard as to the people who were to be benefited by the Bill. What of the British subjects in India: were those who were here now to be entitled to the pension? It might be that crowds of foreigners of the age of forty-five or fifty might come over here in the hope that, having resided in this country for the required time, they might get a pension. He did not believe that the country desired that it should be so. He believed that most of the people wished that the benefits of the Bill should be confined to British-born subjects. With regard to the question of the age of seventy years, that was a point which depended on the money they had; there was no doubt about that. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer's schedule were adopted, he granted that they could not hope to alter the clause so as to provide for a younger age. There had been a case before the War Office in which a discharged man from Woolwich, who was broken-hearted, had committed suicide.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member is discussing his Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 50; Noes, 302. (Division List No. 168.)

AYES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balcarres, Lord
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn J.A.(Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cross, Alexander
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin,)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Magnus, Sir Philip
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nield, Herbert
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Trederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Carlile and Mr. Remnant.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, RtHn SirJ.T (Cheshire
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, RtHn SirW. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, Sir George
M‘Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N)
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. T.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.

Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H.(Denbighs)
Robertson,Sir G Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt.Hn Sir ThomasP
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) said he had an Amendment dealing with the lesser question of including the second subsection of Clause 2 which he submitted he should be entitled to move on a separate issue before the noble Lord the Member for East Marylebone came on.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That might have been moved as an Amendment to the Amendment just disposed of, but the House has now decided that Clause 2 is not to be re-committed.

LORD R. CECIL moved to re-commit Clause 3 as a whole. To begin with, the Government were not satisfied with it as it stood, and they proposed to re-commit it in a very limited way in respect to two of the subsections and paragraph (*a*), which were not discussed. Almost all the discussion on Clause 3 was raised by hon. Members on the other side of the House; but even so, in spite of the known dislike of hon. Members to prolong proceedings they only managed to discuss four and a half lines of the clause, which, when introduced, was some thirty-five lines long. Not a minute was wasted. It was perfectly honest, straightforward discussion on questions of enormous importance, and so effective were the discussions that as far as they went they had succeeded in inserting very considerable Amendments. The Government had come to the conclusion that the whole of one subsection—he thought the most important of all—was absolutely indefensible, and had struck it out and substituted for it an entirely new subsection which, if the House had had an opportunity of discussing it, they would have found equally indefensible. The net result of the alterations was, that as far as he could see, not more than four lines out of the twenty of the original Bill remained, and instead they had sub-sections which occupied thirty-three lines of the Bill, almost all of which, both in drafting and in substance, was entirely new. No Amendments increasing the charge on the taxpayer could be introduced on Report, and the result was that the Government were asking the House to adopt absolutely without discussion or consideration, two of the most vital provisions in the Bill. He would not deal with paragraph (*a*) because the Government said it ought to be recommitted, because it was unworkable, or at any rate, highly unjust. He profoundly wished the right hon. Gentleman had devoted his exceedingly acute intellect to the consideration of paragraph (*b*), and he would have been able to convince the House and the Government that it was not less unjust and less unworkable than paragraph (*a*). It began—

> "If before he becomes entitled to a pension he has failed to work according to his ability, opportunity, and need for the maintenance of himself and those legally dependent upon him."

That by itself opened up an inquiry which not even the Exciseman of genius who would have to work the Bill could possibly carry out. He doubted whether any woman would not come under that disqualification. It was extremely doubtful whether every married woman would not be disqualified. A woman had to show that she had worked habitually for the maintenance of herself and those dependent on her. It would not be easy for most married women over seventy to show that they had maintained themselves, their husbands, and their children by their work. The proviso that a person should not be disqualified who had continuously for ten years up to attaining the age of sixty kept up his subscriptions to a friendly society was an astonishing one. Did it mean the ten years immediately previous to sixty? If it meant the period between fifty and sixty, it was just in those years that many working men found it most difficult to keep up their subscriptions. If it meant any period of ten years, a man who subscribed between the ages of twenty and thirty would be absolutely entitled to a pension though he might have been a wastrel in all the subsequent years. That matter had never been discussed. They had had no kind of explanation and there was no Member who had the least idea which construction was the true one. The clause went on—

> "By means of payments to friendly, provident, and other societies or trade unions or other approved steps."

He could not believe that the Government had considered that difficulty, because it appeared to him that he must continuously for ten years have taken other approved steps. Why on earth should that be so? Supposing that a working man, as many of them did, made an investment by buying a little house property, why should it be necessary for him to spread the operation over ten consecutive years? He could not believe the Government meant that, but that was what their sub-clause said. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in one of his exuberant speeches had said he was going to make membership of a friendly society a charter for a pension. But nothing was clearer than that the clause provided no such thing. It was only to be a removal of the disqualification if he made such provision against old age, sickness, infirmity, or want or loss of employment, as might be recognised as proper provision for the purpose by regulation under the Act. The whole thing was left absolutely in the hands of regulations, and even then it was only for such provision as should be thought to be sufficient. Then came the most astonishing clause of all. It said—

> "And any such provision, when made by the husband, in the case of a married couple living together shall, as respects any right of the wife to a pension, be treated as provision made by the wife as well as by the husband."

That meant that she might be an absolutely abandoned woman, yet if she had been fortunate enough to marry a man who had subscribed to a friendly society she would be entitled to a pension. It was absolutely unreasonable. He did not believe the Government meant it at all, but that was what they said. It was nothing short of a scandal that this clause should go to the country as the deliberate opinion of the House of Commons, when the House had no opportunity of considering it. Because the recommitment of the clause had been asked for from that side they would have no consideration at all. Probably the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not answer at all, or, if he did, it would be in a perfunctory way, and hon. Gentlemen behind him would support him with their votes, and that was the way in which legislation was carried out by a Liberal Government. If the Government considered some of their general election speeches and their promises to restore the House to the consideration of the country and to give the power of free, unfettered speech in debate, they must experience several inconvenient quarters of an hour. He did not appeal to the Government, but asked the House to allow the clause to be recommitted as a whole.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) seconded the Amendment. He said he had had a much longer experience of the Liberal Party than the noble Lord, and he was consequently not so much surprised that their statements in the country had not been borne out by their policy. There were a good many reasons why this clause should be re-committed. One was that it covered nearly one-and-a-half pages of the Bill, and if they left out the first three lines, which were merely descriptive, the House would find that only about two lines had been discussed. He agreed that if the clause was adequately discussed they would probably be sitting until next Thursday before they got to any other part of the Bill. That would be an impossible course unless the Government had learned the lesson that it was a mistake to overload the session and try to drive a willing horse too far. Subsection (*b*) was a most extraordinary proposal. He did not think there was anybody in the House who could state what it meant. He had put down an Amendment to the clause, and if he had been afforded an opportunity of explaining his proposal he might have convinced not only the right hon. Gentleman, but also the party opposite, as to the necessity for it. "Means" might mean anything. Then there occurred the sentence: "Maintenance of himself and those dependent upon him." Really subsection (*b*) ought to have been a clause itself, and it needed considerable discussion. What was really happening was that all the details were to be left to somebody at the Local Government Board where the regulations would be framed. Parliament could not express its intentions on such questions until it had discussed them either in Committee or upstairs, and to give any department power to frame regulations in regard to a clause which had never been discussed either in Committee of the House or in Standing Committee was contrary to all precedent. He hoped the few words he had said might melt the stony heart of the right hon. Gentleman, and that he would grant the concession which had been asked for. If the right hon. Gentleman took that course and accepted his noble friend's proposal, he suggested that his noble friend should give an undertaking that the discussion should terminate in a reasonable time. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be ready to consider any just criticism from whichever side of the House it might come. He begged to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, after the first word 'of,' to insert the words 'Clause 3 and.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE replied that on the Motion to recommit Clause 2 the noble Lord made as earnest, as eloquent, and as long a speech as that which he had just delivered in support of his present Motion. If, as the noble Lord said, a portion of Clause 3 was never discussed, whose fault was that? A day and a half of Parliamentary time, some ten or eleven hours, were allocated to the consideration of the clause, and he had no hesitation in asserting that within that time all the main propositions in the clause could have been debated. He was not going back on old precedents, but he could quote many in which far less time had been allowed for the discussion of clauses of much greater importance. [AN HON. MEMBER: When?] In the Licensing Bill and in the Education Bill there were many clauses which were never debated at all. He was not complaining of that at that particular moment. That was what happened under the operation of the guillotine, and the time to debate that was when the House was asked to adopt or reject the proposal of the Government on that particular point. He would not accept the noble Lord's invitation to point out what time had been wasted, and he would rather not apportion the blame, for that might lead to unnecessary heat. He had only the same answer to give to this Motion as had been given by the Prime Minister and himself to the previous proposition. The Government responded to an appeal made to them to recommit the Bill in respect of the schedule and of two other points, and they had been willing to give three or four hours for discussion and to suspend the eleven o'clock rule in order that the debate might not be interrupted.

MR. WALTER LONG, speaking as one who had been responsible for the administration of the Poor Law, profoundly regretted the decision of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman could not produce one precedent which would justify the action the Government had taken in regard to this particular clause, the first part of which not only involved a reform of the existing Poor Law, but invaded the whole Poor Law system. He marvelled at the attitude of the Law Officers of the Crown with regard to the earlier part of the clause, The Government, in their own interests, would have been wise to have assented to the recommittal of the clause, even if it had involved another day's discussion. What did the Labour Party say? They said: "We do not approve of this Bill in many of its details; but we will do nothing by vote or speech which will retard its progress." They had not taken for the first time this very wise and broad view of the situation; they knew that the Bill contained something of what they wanted, and they knew that these limitations could never be maintained. He ventured to say that the proviso which followed the limitations was one which could not be considered. The first thing which the pension committee and pension officer had to decide and act upon was whether a man had habitually refused to work, or had habitually failed to work according to his opportunities and needs. Everybody could imagine hundreds of cases in every county in England and Wales where the conditions were so peculiar that it would be impossible to apply those words. He did not want a Second Reading discussion that night, although that was what they ought to have had on this clause. The clause as it now stood was not only about three times its original length, but it was going to pass through the Report stage, and from this House to the other House, and could not be discussed or amended. If he had had his way, he would rather have discussed this proviso to subsection (*b*) than any other part of the clause, for he believed they were going to do a great injustice by the proviso which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had put in although he admitted that the Government had done so with the greatest desire to meet the case of the friendly societies. After listening to their speeches, and as a careful observer of their action in Committee, he was convinced that they did not realise what effect the Bill would have on the friendly societies. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised rather quickly in the course of a speech to put an Amendment in the Bill which would meet the friendly societies' case. It was all very well for hon. Gentlemen opposite to say that they were passing a Bill which would give old-age pensions, and to claim immunity for the blunders they were committing; but, unfortunately, there were people who would suffer under their mistakes. He understood that the effect of the proviso was that a man must have contributed to a friendly society for a period of ten years before reaching sixty years of age. That meant that a man who had during the best years of his life subscribed to a friendly society and had found it to be irksome, then falling into drink, would be justified in claiming a pension, unless it could be shown that he had led a dissolute life, as against the man who had never been a subscriber, but who had led a sober and industrious life. The proof that the clause was unsatisfactory was an Amendment to it on the Paper by an hon. Gentleman opposite. There were thousands of men who had not joined friendly societies because of the break-down of several of these societies in the West and South of England forty or fifty years ago, and these men, although they had led industrious respectable lives, would not be touched by the clause as it stood. Then they ought to have some explanation of the words "legally dependent upon." Take the case of a young married man with a family. He was bound to contribute to the maintenance of his destitute father and mother. Was the House going to enact that if such a man, with wages of 14s. or 15s. a week, failed in this respect that he was to be prevented from enjoying the privileges conferred by the Bill? It was a scandal that words which debarred men from claiming pensions should go through the House without debate, knowing as they did that it was only in Committee that they could make any alterations. He had been in the House for many years, and he had never yet witnessed obstructive tactics adopted by hon. Members without a feeling of regret. Hon. Members opposite who brought so lightly the charge of obstruction would find before a year had passed over their heads that every word uttered by the Opposition in criticism of the Bill would be justified in its working, and they would have to explain, and not the Opposition, why it was the Bill was pushed through Parliament at such great speed, and why criticisms and objections had found no response among the supporters of the Government and no answer from the Government itself. It was only because he honestly believed that if there was not some change in the wording the clause would operate unjustly, that he supported the Amendment, and the charge of obstruction made against them by hon. Members opposite was absolutely without justification.

Question put.

The House divided—Ayes, 72; Noes, 337. (Division List No. 169.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Haddock, George B.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nield, Herbert
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Lord Edmund Talbot and Mr. Forster.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)

Mr. Walter Long.

Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romfr'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T (Cheshire
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W. H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew,W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon,RtHn.Sir W.Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W. Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim,N.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, Hon E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)

Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H.(Denbighs.
Robertson,Sir GScott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowden
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russel, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, JWH.(Somerset,E.
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph
Ward,John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J.D.(Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn,Sir ThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carm'rth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York,W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.H.(Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St.Pancras,S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. ASQUITH rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided—Ayes, 334; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 170.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. H.
Barry,Redmond J.(Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,SGeo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir JH.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T.R. (Essex,Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHn.Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, H. W.
Craig,Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William

Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dickinson,WH.(St. Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder,Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,RtHn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats,Sir T.(Fenfrew,W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody(Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon,RtHn.Sir WBrampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,RtHn, L.(Rossendale
Harcourt,Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy,George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harvey, A.G.C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Col.Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E)
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim,N)
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay. (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willan
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H.(Denbighs)
Robertson,Sir G Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)

Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn. Sir Thomas P
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn J. A. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kerry, Earl of
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, re-committed in respect of the Schedule and in respect of the Amendments to paragraphs (i.) and (ii.) of the proviso to paragraph (*a*) of Clause 3, standing on the Notice Paper in the name of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer as Amendments to be moved on re-committal.

Bill considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE moved to insert the words, "including food or comforts." There was some doubt whether the words in the Bill would really include that particular provision, and in order to make it quite clear he moved.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 10, after the word 'assistance,' to insert the words 'including food or comforts.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted.'

LORD R. CECIL asked if it was quite clear that these words covered medical or surgical assistance to any member of the applicant's family.

*SIR CHARLES W. DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he had looked at the words very carefully, as the promise had been made to him, and he thought they would cover the case as arranged.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Certainly.

SIR F. BANBURY asked what was intended to be covered by the word "comforts" It was rather a wide term and it might include all sorts of things, coals, bedding or tobacco.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asid that the word "comforts" was the most comprehensive term they could suggest, and it was very well known what it meant.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE moved to insert after "hospital" in Clause 3 "or the payment of any expenses of the burial of a dependent."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 14, after the word 'hospital,' to insert the words 'or of the funeral expenses of any such dependent.'"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR F. BANBURY said the word "dependent" was a curious sort of word. He saw the Attorney-General was in his place, and he would like him to give the Committee a definition of the word, stating what it covered and what it did not cover.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said that "dependents" was a word very well known in statutes. It meant a person whom the pensioner would be under a legal obligation to maintain. The word was frequently used in the Workmen's Compensation Act and in the Poor Law, and there was no difficulty in giving it the ordinary construction.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule:

MR. HOLT (Northumberland, Hexham) moved the following Amendment, "In line 25 of the schedule to leave out all the words after 'exceeding' to the end and to substitute the following schedule: 'Where the means of the person does not exceed per annum £22 10s. pension 5s. per week; £25, pension, 4s. 6d.; £27 10s., pension 4s.; £30 pension 3s. 6d.; £32 10s., pension 3s. £35, pension 2s. 6d.; £37 10s., pension 2s.; above £37 10s., no pension.'" The object of this Amendment was to secure that a man who had saved 10s. or 12s. a week should be in a better position than the man who had saved only 8s. The man who had saved 9s., for instance, would receive 4s. 6d., or 13s. 6d. in all, against the 13s. received by the man who had saved 8s. The objection to the Amendment was, of course, that it would cost more money. Would it be more expensive than the schedule of the Government? He had been inquiring into the pensions paid by a certain public authority to its workmen, and he found that there were 206 pensions, the lowest being 7s. 6d. and the highest 15s. a week. Under the Government schedule it would have to pay. 372 shillings a week, and under his schedule it would pay 610. His scale was graduated by falls of 6d. from 5s. to 2s. No pension was payable below that amount, the income limit which excluded a person from getting a pension being an amount exceeding £37 10s., At first sight his scale appeared to be more costly than that of the Government, but his impression was that the private pensions would be reduced almost at once to 8s., as people did not like to pay out of their pockets for the benefit of the taxpayer, and a similar line of argument would influence friendly and benefit societies, who would recast their rules so as to get as much out of the Exchequer as possible, and to have more to distribute among other people. If there was any doubt as to which scale would cost most to the Exchequer there could not be any doubt as to which one was going to be of the greatest benefit to the pensioners.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 25, to leave out from the word 'exceed' to the end of the schedule, and to insert—

	s.	d.
"£22 10s.	5	0
Exceed £22 10s., but do not exceed £25	4	6
Exceed £25, but do not exceed £27 10s.	4	0
Exceed £27 10s., but do not exceed £30	3	6
Exceed £30, but do not exceed £32 10s.	3	0
Exceed £32 10s., but do not exceed £35	2	6
Exceed £35, but do not exceed £37 10s.	2	0
Exceed £37 10s.	No pension."	

—(*Mr. Holt.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to '4s. 0d.,' in line 26, stand part of the schedule."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Government could not accept the scale suggested, which would cost over £800,000 a year more than the Government scale. The scheme was ingenious, but it was rather complicated and complex, and subtle schemes generally came to grief when an attempt was made to put them in operation. The plan of the Government was a plan which had already worked well in New Zealand, New South Wales, and one or two other colonies. His hon. friend seemed to assume that under the Government scheme there would be a real danger of the reduction of pensions paid by authorities like dock authorities to 8s. a week. But the scale of such pensions could surely be adapted not merely to the Government scheme, but to any scale introduced into the Bill, so long as it was graded according to income. That was why he would avoid the complicated and difficult scale suggested by his hon. friend. It was far better to stick to the scale which in the experience of the colonies had worked very well.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said they were discussing the schedule under circumstances of great difficulty, approaching it for the first time after the hour at which ordinary sittings of the House had closed. He thought the proposal made by the hon. Member worthy of more consideration than the Chancellor of the Exchequer had vouchsafed. They knew that in these matters the first aspect of the case was often misleading, and the resolution at which the Government first arrived in the matter was not that which they reached when they had heard the subject discussed. If the Committee had had to debate the question of adopting a fixed limit or a sliding scale under conditions similar to those under which they were compelled now to discuss the nature of the sliding scale, the fixed limit would have been still embodied in the Bill, for it was not until half a day had been spent in debate upon the point and one or two supporters of the Government had spoken against the sliding scale that Ministers decided to alter their plan.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said the opportunity of discussing the sliding scale and that of discussing whether a sliding scale or a fixed limit of income should be adopted were exactly the same. The discussion on the latter point began at eight o'clock, and the Government offered to begin the discussion that evening at eight o'clock.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he declined to be drawn into a controversy at that hour as to the reasonableness of the time allowed for debate on other parts of the Bill not discussed at all. They were endeavouring to find out what would be the effect of the Bill on such questions as were raised by his hon. friend a few minutes ago. For instance, whether a man who had been convicted wrongfully and had received a free pardon, would not be excluded from any right to a pension for ten years afterwards. If they did so they would not get home till morning, or till they ought to be meeting again. He was pointing out when the Chancellor of the Exchequer interposed, that the Prime Minister spoke against the sliding scale, and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer also spoke against it.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I did not.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the Chancellor of the Exchequer wobbled. It was not the unaided intelligence of the

Government which brought them to the conclusion embodied in the sliding scale which they submitted. It was prolonged discussion which had induced them to modify the Bill profoundly, and if opportunity for debate were afforded they might be induced to modify the schedule. He was one of those who from the first desired the sliding scale rather than the fixed limit, and now that they had got the sliding scale accepted he joined with the hon. Gentleman opposite in appealing to the Government to reconsider the terms of the sliding scale they had put into the Bill. Of course, private Members had no real means of making calculations worth the paper they were made on as to what would be the cost of any particular change. They could only argue the general principle, and leave the Government to apply the general principle to the money which was available, and to the circumstances in which they were placed. The right hon. Gentleman had told them he could not accept the Amendment because it would add £900,000 to the expense already laid on the country by this Bill. That was a very substantial reason, but would the right hon. Gentleman tell them how he had arrived at that estimate? Had he assumed that everyone who now paid a pension, under whatever name, to an old person would continue to pay it, even though that old person would be no better off than if that pension was less than it was? He was not going to pay two or five shillings a week for the purpose not of benefiting the person to whom he paid it, but of saving the Exchequer which was to pay the money. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the directors were trying to get the wages paid out of the Exchequer. But that was impossible under a sliding scale. It seemed rather an offensive suggestion to make that his hon. friend or his clients wished to push off an obligation of their own on to the Exchequer.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the right hon. Gentleman had no right to say that. He had simply been replying to the argument which the hon. Gentleman himself had advanced that it would be possible to shuffle off the responsibility on to the Exchequer.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that that was not the argument of the hon. Gentleman, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had no right to impute it to him or to anyone on that side of the House. The suggestion was, not that directors might wish to pay their wages out of the Exchequer, but that, if a man did not benefit by saving, the incentive to continue to save was destroyed. If he did not benefit by any pension or gratuity which he received from his late or present employers, the Government destroyed their incentive to continue the payments. It was accordingly urged that, in any sliding scale inserted in the Bill, they should give a clear advantage to the man at each stage of the sliding scale that would prevent those who were now assisting him in his old age from withdrawing their assistance when the Bill passed. It was a reasonable proposition that there might be some old person in whom a man might be interested, who was known to him and whom he would assist to obtain an old-age pension. The first question asked would be what his resources were, and who contributed towards them, and those who contributed would withdraw their contribution if they found he did not benefit. He had no means of checking the calculations of the right hon. Gentleman, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer assumed that people would continue to pay what they now gave voluntarily after the greater comfort of the recipient had ceased to act as a reason. He believed this to be an unfounded assumption, and wholly illusory.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said he supported the Amendment, because if it were carried he hoped they would be able to persuade the House to leave out all after the word "exceed" in the schedule, and his hon. friend the Member for Barnard Castle might be able to move out the words "£22 10s.," and insert the words "£26," so as to insure with the minimum pension 15s. a week. It would be a great pity, he thought, to spoil an otherwise excellent measure for the sake of £100,000, or whatever it might cost. People whose income was 10s. a week would naturally feel agrieved if they were to be penalised to the advantage of people whose income was more than 10s.

a week. He hoped the Government even now would realise that if the scheme they were supporting created this injustice it would cause a great deal of dissatisfaction and discontent. The right hon. Gentleman must remember when he quoted New Zealand that the pension there was 10s., and if a small young Colony could afford to give that the Mother Country at least could afford to give 5s. a week to those whose incomes did not exceed 10s. a week. He appealed to the Government, therefore, not to oppose the Amendment.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) supported the Amendment because he desired to see it incorporated in the Bill, and he was sorry it had been met with so uncompromising a refusal from the right hon. Gentleman. He hoped, however, that even now the last word had not been spoken upon it. The only alteration it was proposed to make in the schedule was in the amount of pension to be granted. Upon what ground could it be said by the pension officer or the Government that it would complicate matters to grant 4s. 6d. any more than to grant 4s., which was the Government proposal? It seemed to him in the matter of complication there was nothing to be said against the proposed amended schedule that did not already prevail against the scale of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman's second objection to the proposed amended scale was that it would be much more costly than the scale of the Government. They had not the means of arriving at exact figures and they could not tell how much it was going to cost more than the Government scheme, but he thought that the right hon. Gentleman had under-estimated the cost of the existing scale if he was taking it on the basis of the present payment of friendly societies, trade unions, and benevolent employers. It was quite obvious that under the Government scale there would be no incentive to any employer, trade union, or friendly society to grant any sum of money between 8s. and 13s. per week to any employee or subscriber, and sooner or later there would be a reduction in all these grants to the 8s., which entitled the recipients to the full Government pension. He should have imagined that the Government in their calculations would have taken the effect of that tendency into account, and he was surprised to hear that the scale proposed by his hon. friend was really going to cost £900,000 more than the Government scale. Even assuming that the scale proposed by his hon. friend would cost this extra money, they could instead of removing altogether the incentive to save between 8s. and 13s., cut off the pension when they reached the higher stages and say a man who had 8s. per week should have 5s., a man who had 9s. should have 4s. 6d., and a man who had 10s. should have 4s., and that there should be no more pensions until such time as they had more money to grant them. In that case they would not be spending more money than the Government at the present provided, and the scale would not be open to the objection that they were putting a burden on the taxpayer, whilst they would be granting pensions without depriving a man of the incentive to be thrifty. He could not see, therefore, why the Government should not give fair consideration to the proposal, even if they could not go the whole length proposed. At any rate their proposal, within the limits of their money, would then be a good one. They would be granting pensions where they were most needed, and granting those who had been careful and had saved more than 8s., something more than those who had not saved so much. It was of infinite importance that the people should understand that the more they saved the better off they would be. It was really a great blot on the Government scheme, valuable as that scheme was, that it was legitimately open to the charge that it gave no encouragement to saving between 8s. and 13s. It was all the more regrettable because the blot was not inevitable. It could be remedied by the proposal before the House without costing the country any more money, and without in the least adding to the complication of the Bill. He believed hon. Members wanted the schedule to be as good as they could possibly make it; and he was convinced, if it were left to their unfettered decision to say which was the best schedule, some such schedule as that now proposed which would secure that the man who had saved most should have the largest income would commend itself to the House.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) thought the speeches to which they had listened would convince the House that there was a very great deal to be said for the Amendment. There was no question that this schedule, whatever its defects, was founded upon the only right principle—that the pension scheme ought to have some regard to the thrift of the recipient and that the pension ought to bear some proportion to the provision which a man had made for himself. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had refused the Amendments on two grounds. He was bound to say he really once again showed that he had not seriously considered the Amendment which he disposed of in a few airy phrases to which they had become accustomed. He had said that the scale could not be adopted, because it was too subtle and complicated, and would not be effective in practice. That contention had been blown to pieces by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. It was a novel objection to say that proposals on this Bill were subtle, because, if ever there was a Bill which was subtle and complicated, through and through, from beginning to end, it was this Bill. If any fortunate old person ever managed to get through all the enormous entanglements which the Bill set up between him and his pension there would probably be a public subscription got up for him. The only real objection the right hon. Gentleman made was that it would cost too much and that he had not got the money. He had told them it would cost £900,000 more than the Government schedule. He thought they were entitled upon a matter of this vital importance to something more than that mere statement of the right hon. Gentleman. He did not doubt it was so, but the details of the calculation could have nothing confidential about them, and if they knew them they would be able to see what the real character of the calculation was. The right hon. Gentleman had given them no details, but only said it would cost £900,000 more. There was no objection in principle to the schedule, which could perfectly well be adapted to any sum which the Government had at their disposal. The hon. Gentleman had suggested that it could be made less expensive by cutting off the last two lines, the 12s. 6d. and 13s. 6d. a week. He thought that would be a wrong way because it would knock out a relatively small number of persons who were in relatively small need of and got relatively small pensions. It would be better in addition to knocking off the last two lines to begin the whole schedule lower down—to begin with a man earning 6s. 6d. instead of 7s. 6d. But that, after all, was a matter for the Government to consider. His point was that the principle of the schedule, it was not denied by the Government, was the right principle and the objection which they made to it, that they could not afford it, fell to the ground and could easily be removed by adjusting the schedule itself in order to meet any sum which the Government had at their disposal. Having at the invitation of the Government embarked upon the discussion of the schedule, upon the justice of which the whole future of the scheme really depended, it seemed to him that the answer which had been given was a very *jejune* and small one not altogether worthy of the right hon. Gentleman. He would be unable to vote for the schedule as it stood in view of the additional cost, but he would be able to support the hon. Member in moving the Government schedule out in order to insert another. He objected to the Bill altogether, but if they were to have an old-age pension scheme they should take every means to see that it was just and sound.

MR. SIMON (Essex, Walthamstow) said he was entirely unconvinced by the answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There were really two questions here quite separate in importance and in the extent to which the ordinary private Member could judge of them. One was the actual question, how much one schedule would cost the Treasury more than another. It was profoundly important, but not a matter on which the ordinary private Member could form an independent opinion. But, apart from that altogether, there was involved in this Amendment a difference in principle, and he desired, with great respect, to ask the Government whether he was not right in thinking that their scheme was one which put no inducement whatever upon a man who had once got as much as 8s. a week to get any more, unless he got at least 13s. a week. In the second place, he desired to ask them whether this proposed system did not provide some stimulus for thrift which the Government system failed to do. If he was right in thinking these two things, was he really to be told that it passed the wit of man and the Treasury to devise a scheme which embraced the better principle? He entirely declined to believe it, and if the eminent gentlemen who advised the Chancellor of the Exchequer were able to tell him that this scheme was going to cost £900,000 more than the other he had no doubt they could tell him what modifications of the scheme were necessary in order that they might not commit themselves to too great extra expenditure. It was said there was many and many a man who came to the end of his life, and had saved only 8s. a week, who was a much better man and worthier citizen than a man who had saved 12s. But they must proceed on some general rule, and unless it was going to be said that the encouragement of thrift between these limits of weekly saving was utterly unimportant and that, speaking generally, a man was a better citizen, because he had saved less rather than more, he really did not see the force and the relevance of the observation. Then it was said that the proposal was complicated, but it was not complicated a bit. It was quite as easy to follow as the Government scheme. In both cases it was necessary to know that there were fifty-two weeks in the year and to be able to do a long division sum. If they could not do it in their heads they had to do it on a piece of paper. He did not think he would be doing his duty if he silently supported a scheme which contained, as he thought, seed of real vice, in that it did not offer an actual inducement to saving. At the same time he agreed with the hon. Member opposite in seeing the impossibility of voting in the dark for some further expenditure, and he therefore appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to tell him, since he had assistance at his command which private Members had not, what were the modifications necessary to be made in the scheme in order that they might be able to spend that sum of money which the Government said they could find.

MR. WALTER LONG said the main objection of the Government was that the scheme of the hon. Gentleman opposite involved an extra expenditure of £900,000. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had an opportunity of considering the schedule which in the Committee stage stood in the name of the hon. Member for Maidstone and which carried out every one of the suggestions just advanced by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite. It gave a distinct advantage as between the different grades of those who had saved, and therefore encouraged thrift. It started by giving more to the poorer man and less to the man who was better off, while it involved exactly the same expenditure. It started with an income of £13 a year, and ended with an income of £26 5s. It gave the man with an income of £13 a year 6s. a week, and the man with £26 5s. a year 2s. a week, and the pensions were graded between so that the annual income was slightly increased with the increase of personal savings. That being the case he thought it answered every suggestion which the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite had just made. The Opposition were in exactly the same position as the hon. and learned Gentleman. They would like to have the existing schedule left out in the first instance in order that the Government might put in a fresh one—either one of those which appeared on the Paper, or else alter their own. He begged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider whether he was justified in closing the door altogether to the suggestion that had been made, namely, that, whatever the schedule was, it should do something distinctly to encourage thrift. That was not the description of the Government schedule. The difference was only one of sixpence, he believed. It sounded ridiculous to ask a man to indulge in self-denial for years for the sake of 6d., but if the pension were based on the schedule of his noble friend there was a distinct advantage to be gained by the pensioner, and although he would be glad to see it greater, it was an improvement on the Government's schedule. If the Government would be willing to leave out their schedule, and then consider the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman opposite, amending it to meet their case or else bring forward a fresh one, it would be a satisfactory proceeding. The schedule to which he had referred involved not one penny more expenditure than the Government were prepared to meet. It took the original limit of the Government, namely 10s. 5d. a week as the maximum, it started with a lower sum than was taken by the Government, it gave more to the poor man and less to the better-off man, and the increase of income grew with the amount saved by the recipient. Therefore, it had every advantage to recommend it and he could not help regretting that the Government were not willing to accept the proposal.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the right hon. Gentleman had asked him to express an opinion upon the schedule suggested by the hon. Member for Maidstone. It was a cheaper schedule than the Government schedule by £450,000. It was not for him as Chancellor of the Exchequer to object to that, but he doubted whether he could persuade the Committee to accept it.

MR. WALTER LONG said the schedule had been very carefully prepared. He had not the figures with him, but he had seen them. He could not believe a saving of £400,000 was involved. According to the figures he had seen the expenditure worked out almost identically the same as the expenditure under the Government proposals, besides which greater advantages were provided.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: But it runs up from 5s. to 10s.

MR. WALTER LONG: Yes.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was informed that the scheme worked out at something like £400,000 less than the Government scheme, and though he did not think the House of Commons would accept it at that stage, if there was a general feeling to save the Exchequer £400,000 it would not be very difficult to persuade him at any rate to give it very careful consideration. He could not help thinking, however, that his hon. friends had been exercising their well-known ingenuity to very little purpose. What did it mean? The Amendment was represented as a scale which was a great inducement to thrift. What was the great inducement to thrift? It was that the individual might be able to make 6d. out of it. The suggestion was that a man would not merely go on saving, but would so ingeniously adapt his savings that he would not save 8s. but 9s. in order to be able to make 6d. out of it when seventy years of age. It was too fantastic. Of course any man by the exercise of his ingenuity could invent all sorts of conditions and possible contingencies of that kind, but they were not practical. A man when thirty or forty years of age did not sit down to plan how to save every penny he could so as to save exactly the sum that would enable him at the age of seventy years to get an extra 6d. out of the revenue. That was not the way a man acted. A man began to save without any particular consideration of the actual amount he would have when seventy years of age. The inducement to thrift would largely remain, and he could not believe that any man would so adapt, as it were, the whole savings of his life in order to make the difference between 8s. or 9s. according to the very ingenious scale suggested by his hon. friend. The hon. Member for Appleby had said that if the Government could not accept the scale of the hon. Member for Hexham, would they not accept the improvised scale which he had proposed in the course of the debate? Was his hon. friend quite sure where it stopped?

*MR. LEIF JONES said the Amendment was not improvised. It was put down in the Committee stage and was now on the Paper. The suggestion he made in the course of the debate was that if there were not enough money to meet the whole scale it should stop at the point where it affected the higher incomes.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE asked if his hon. friend knew that the scale he proposed would cost an extra £815,000 a year to the Exchequer?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell us how these estimates were arrived at?

MR. LLOYD-GEGRGE said he would state quite frankly to the Committee that he had to depend on the actuaries of the Department. That was the only answer he could give. The only instructions he gave were that the actuaries were to ascertain on a proper actuarial basis what the proposals in the Amendment would cost. He was anxious to find out exactly what they came to, and the figures he had quoted were given to him by actuaries who arrived at them in the usual way. He thought that was the only possible business way of arriving at a proper estimate. If his hon. friend was referring to his Amendment on the Paper, he was sorry he suggested it was improvised. That, as he had said, would cost £815,000 more to the Exchequer, and really what he had to say about all these schemes was what he had said before, that he would rather the money should be spent in extending the benefits to the very poor, but if they took away £800,000 or £900,000 in order to give it to the comparatively well-off they could not spend it on the very poor. He believed it was the right hon. Gentleman opposite who asked if the Government had tried any alternative of their own upon the principle contained in these suggestions. Well, the Government had, and the very nearest approach they could get to the cost of their present scheme was £330,000 more. They did not think that this mere sixpence thrift was worth £330,000 a year, when they wanted money saved for the purpose of dealing with the paupers, as he hoped they would be able to next year. Under these circumstances he trusted the Committee would not think he was giving a perfunctory answer. These things had been gone into most carefully. He confessed he was rather attracted by the suggestion of the hon. Member for Hexham. He thought that there was an idea to be worked upon, because he was just as anxious as hon. Members that the scheme should be a real encouragement to thrift. He thought it was a very ingenious idea, and started with that view to ascertain what it would really cost. They tried all kinds of alternatives but could not find one which would cost less than £330,000, and under those circumstances they had to abandon the idea. After all, it was not a plan for which any other country had set a precedent. The plan of the Government was the only one which had been pursued up to the present in any other country.

*MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said he did not wish to labour the point at that time of night, and he wished to state he was not one of those who asked for 1d. more on the sliding scale than that which was involved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposals. He had not got actuarial figures, but he could not help feeling that, if instead of 5s. with those who had 10s. they stopped at 5s. with 8s., and then raised the scale to 4s. 6d. with 9s., and 4s. with 10s., it gave a margin for over 10s. because anyone could see that there was a saving of 6d. on the second class and 1s. on the third class. He was not concerned to go up to 13s. or even 12s. 6d., but he was concerned about keeping away from the dead level between 8s. and 13s., which was no advantage, and he was sure would create a tendency to unload. He was managing director of a works which gave 1,200 to 1,300 pensions of 12s. to 13s. a week, and the very first thing his colleagues said was that they should reduce the pension below 8s., because they would be able to give pensions to more men. If the Government only went up to 10s. or 10s 6d., and graded the pensions in the way suggested it would appeal to the country, as a man would not have his pension docked off to the extent of the equivalent he had saved. By the permission of the Government they had been allowed to discuss the sliding scale that night not, he took it, with a view to pressing the

Chancellor of the Exchequer to give more money, because he agreed they ought to spend it on the poorer people, but in order to deal with arithmetical calculations. He was not asking for anything extra or he would not be standing there, but he only wanted to repeat with emphasis the wish of himself and his hon. friends that this scale should not be open to objections.

*MR. CHAPLIN (Surrey, Wimbledon) said he had hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have been moved by the series of appeals which had been made to him from his own side of the House, but he was afraid the right hon. Gentleman had altogether failed to grasp first of all the objections to his present proposal which came from his own side, and, secondly, the effect of the Amendment which had been pressed on the right hon. Gentleman's attention by his right hon. friend the Member for South Dublin. What was the root of all the objections which came from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's own side of the House? It was that the Bill of the Government and their present proposal gave no encouragement whatever to thrift. The right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee half a dozen times in the course of his speeches that he was most anxious to do something in the Bill to promote and encourage thrift, but from the commencement of the Bill in its original form, when a hard and fast line had been drawn at an income of 10s. a week, it had been nothing but the greatest possible discouragement to thrift.

*MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): On a point of order, is it in order for the right hon. Gentleman to lecture the Government on its alleged lack of encouragement of thrift amongst the working classes when it is notorious that he has himself so little displayed this quality in the course of his life that he has had to make a declaration of insufficiency of means in order to qualify for an allowance from the taxpayers of this country to the extent of £1,200 a year——? [Cries of "Oh," and "Order."]

THE CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman is absolutely in order

*MR. CHAPLIN said the interruption only showed how extremely little attention was paid by some hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House to the discussion which was going on. He had been humbly endeavouring to support and enforce the views which had been submitted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer from his own side without any effect at all up to the present. Some improvement, he admitted, had been made by the Amendment that had been moved by the Government themselves with regard to a sliding scale, but unfortunately the sliding scale that they had moved was extremely deficient. His right hon. friend had called attention to an Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Maidstone. There was another Amendment almost precisely of the same character moved by his hon. friend the Member for Worcester. Either of these Amendments would have had the effect of encouraging thrift, though he agreed with his right hon. friend that the Amendment standing in the name of the noble Lord the Member for Maidstone would have encouraged thrift rather more than the other. That was why he desired in a very few words to press it upon the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who did not appear to have considered the Amendment in the Committee stage or to have paid much attention to what fell from his right hon. friend; but the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer differed entirely from that of the noble Lord the Member for Maidstone, in the very respect which had been enforced upon him, or tried to be enforced upon him, by Members on his own side. It began at a lower scale than the Amendment which was put on the Paper by the Government. Might he endeavour to impress upon the right hon. Gentleman what was the effect of this Amendment? Instead of beginning as the right hon. Gentleman did at £21 a year, it began at £13, which was equal to 5s. per week. Where that was the case it gave as a pension 6s. per week, bringing the pensioner's income up to 11s. altogether. The next stage was where the income was 6s. 1¾d. a week, in which case 5s. a week pension was given, making the income just over 11s. a week. The third scale was that where the income was 7s. 4½d. the pensioner got 4s. a week pension, or slightly over 11s. altogether. The fourth stage was where the income was 8s. 8¾d., when the pension was 3s., which brought the total again just over 11s. The last stage was where the income was 10s. a week, when the pension was 2s. a week. The great advantage of this in his opinion—and he believed it was the opinion of the large majority of the Committee—was that, even at the last stage there was a distinct inducement still to practice thrift, because the individual would get a pension of 2s. a week. That differed entirely from the scheme of the Government, because according to that scheme, the last stage was reached when the income exceeded 12s. a week when there was no pension at all. Was it not perfectly plain that a man had absolutely no encouragement to thrift whatever after his income had reached that stage? On the contrary, it was a positive disadvantage to him to save after that amount because there was no pension at all. Any Government which did anything to discourage thrift was committing something worse than a blunder; it was a positive crime. The appeals which he had endeavoured to submit had been enforced over and over again by resolutions of all the great friendly societies in this country, and it had been a matter of deep regret to him to see the way in which the representation of their views had been received by a Government which, while it did exactly the contrary, professed time after time that there were no people in the world more anxious to encourage thrift than they were themselves.

Mr. W. R. REA (Scarborough) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to be under the impression that those who had put forward the scheme suggested were engaged upon a raid on the Treasury. Nothing was further from their minds than that they should increase to any appreciable extent the burden already thrown upon the Exchequer by the Bill. They felt, however, that they were not legislating for a single year, but that they were sitting upon a general principle. It was only wise that they should look forward beyond the demand of the coming year, and, if possible, lay down some scheme which would be consistent with the encouragement of thrift. He wished to demur to what fell from the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he said the question was a mere paltry one of 6d. per week of saving on the part of the pensioner. It was nothing of the sort; it was a question of how an employer who had a certain amount of money to spend in charity could best spend that money. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said there would be nobody so thriftless as to dispose of his income. He had his doubts on that point; but he would urge that it was the duty of the custodians of public money and even of money belonging to public companies not to spend it in indiscriminate charity which would not be to the benefit of the recipients, but could only benefit the Treasury, but they were bound to distribute that money over a larger number of pensions. Had the Chancellor of the Exchequer in distributing his £900,000 thoroughly taken that fact into account, and would he not find that the cost of his present scheme would be considerably heavier than the actuarial calculations would justify him in supposing, owing to the ethical considerations as regarded deductions which would be made by the employers? The Committee recognised, of course, that it was impossible to add to the cost of the scheme during the present year, but he would ask the Government whether they had not had some scheme worked out on the basis of the suggestion of the hon. Member for Appleby; and whether the right hon. Gentleman could not undertake not to put a new schedule in at the tail end of the Bill at the present moment, but to consider if he could not put the Bill in such a form that when he had money to spend—perhaps not next year, but the year afterwards—and when the Bill was enlarged, as enlarged it must be, that enlargement would not be such as to put a premium on thriftlessness.

Mr. LEVERTON HARRIS said he wanted to put one question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon.

Gentleman had given the Committee some very interesting figures; he had told them that one of the alternative proposals would cost £830,000 more, and the other £900,000 more, and that these figures had been based upon very careful actuarial calculations by the Treasury. What he wanted to ask was whether, in making those calculations, any estimate was made of those who were at present enjoying pensions from outside sources and who would, under the Government scheme, have those pensions reduced; and, secondly, would the cost be greater than it would be if those pensions were continued? He would give one case which bore on this question. He had a man working in his garden at the present time, whom he paid 12s. a week, and he would get 1s. from the Government. If he reduced the man's pension to 8s. a week he would get 5s. from the Government and still get 13s. a week. There was nothing to prevent him reducing that man's pension to 8s. a week. He did not say he would do it, but he imagined a great many others would, and what he asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer was whether in the figures of £800,000 or £900,000 due allowance had been made for a probable number who would have their present pensions reduced.

*MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate) said that however excellent the proposal of the hon. Member for Hexham might be in itself, there was one insuperable objection to it, and that was the cost it must involve. They were told on the authority of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it was going to cost the country £900,000 a year more. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Worcestershire had informed the House that only a Member of the Government advised by the Government officials could really obtain a correct actuarial calculation in matters of this sort, and he would like to impress upon the House that if they were to spend more money on old-age pensions, the first claim surely was that of the old people who were in receipt of outdoor relief at the present time. During the whole course of the debates in connection with this Bill, he had been attempting to say something of the unfortunate position of those people of seventy-five and eighty years of age, who had received outdoor relief for the first time this year, and he thought if they were to spend any more money, it should be spent on those persons. For that reason he trusted the Committee would reject this Amendment and any other Amendment which necessitated extra expenditure, and would keep in view the fact that every extra penny which was spent should for the present be spent on these old people. There would never be a perfect scheme until they found enough money to give everybody an old-age pension, without any qualification whatever.

*MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside) said he wanted to put before the Committee a view which had not been touched so far in the discussion. It had been assumed throughout that the main object of the Bill should be to promote what was commonly called thrift. The term, he considered, was a misnomer. Thrift was merely wise expenditure, but in this discussion it had been taken only to mean non-expenditure. A man might wisely expend on certain things, and by saving on those things have something to spend on something else. If he did that always, he was practising thrift in the strictest sense of the term. It had been constantly assumed that the object of the Bill was to encourage saving for investment, but that could go too far, for it was plain there were limits to the possibility of investments. The field for investment was necessarily limited. If the democracy next year were to save £100,000,000 more than they saved this year, it would be, according to the argument that had been used, an excellent thing to do. But the effect of saving that amount —that was of withholding the sum from expenditure—would be a lessening of consumption. The working-classes, indeed, would save themselves into unemployment. That was strictly a paradox. The proper meaning of the word "paradox" was not "fallacy," but a proposition which seemed to be false but was in fact true. The fallacy of most critics of this measure was the assumption that saving for investment was in the nature of things unlimited. To think that saving could go on to an indefinite extent, and that the savings could be successfully invested was a very gross empirical fallacy. The limit of successful saving for investment was the point at which the investment yielded that for which there was a demand.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the economic argument of the hon. Member seemed to be a little remote from the question.

*MR. J. M. ROBERTSON said that his proposition was that the object of this Bill should not be first and foremost to encourage further saving for investment, because blind and unlimited encouragement of saving for investment was merely an inducement to what must prove to be loss. That was an economic fact. There was annually a vast amount of saving which was doomed to loss because there did not exist sufficient means for investment beyond a certain sum, and the House was empirically urging upon everyone unlimited saving for investment, when in the nature of the case such unlimited saving for investment must involve loss of a large amount of the saved money. He was trying to repel an argument which had been reiterated a hundred times in the discussion and which was apparently taken for granted without the slightest analysis.

*MR. JOYNSON-HICKS (Manchester, N.W.) said that thrift as he understood it was putting by for a rainy day, and the reason he was supporting the Amendment was that for the first time it embodied in the Bill a word in favour of thrift. The only argument really used against the Amendment was that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it would cost an extra £900,000. That had nothing to do with the Opposition. The Chancellor of the Exchequer could look after his own hen roosts. He should have realised before he brought in the Bill that there would be a demand from all sides of the House to make it a more reasonable measure. Amendment after Amendment had been suggested from the Opposition side of the House, and also from Labour Members. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil had said he was going to raise a further Amendment increasing the limit of income which permitted a pension from 8s. to 10s., for which he would certainly vote, because sooner or later, probably within the next twelve months, all these painful wire entanglements would be bound to be swept away. The whole scheme would have to be simplified and would cost more money, and it was just as well that the Government which had initiated this scheme should have the responsibility of bringing in a proper one and the burden of finding the money.

MR. MADDISON (Burnley) did not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer had addressed himself to the one proposition before the Committee, which was not a question of increasing the amount from the Treasury but of utilising to the best advantage the money he had at his disposal. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman gave that consideration to the question which it deserved, when he merely talked about the scheme of the hon. Member for Hexham being fantastic. The moment the right hon. Gentleman left the fixed income with the small amount of money at his disposal he was sure to get into some fantastic proposals. Did the right hon. Gentleman say that it was not fantastic in a scheme that a man who had 12s. a week got no more than the man who had 8s.? The hon. Member for Tyneside had offered a very learned disquisition about thrift, which he could not attempt to follow, but he would like to say that for the purpose of this Bill they had to assume thrift when it existed in a concrete form, because they could not very well tell when the expenditure had been wise. He quite agreed there was thrift in wise expenditure, but for the purpose of the Bill how could they say over a long course of years if the expenditure had been wise? Therefore, he would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he could not take the principle of the scheme of the hon. Member for Hexham and confine it within the limits of the money he possessed. If the right hon. Gentleman did that he would at any rate get away from the anomaly that a man with 8s. a week got just as much as a man with 9s., or, rather, that the man with 9s. got no more than the man with 8s. So far from helping the poor—and he was entirely with the right hon. Gentleman there—he ventured to say that under his sliding scale it did not do that at all, because in order to give the pension to a man who had 11s. or 12s. he had reduced the pension of the man who had got 9s. or 10s. a week. He thought there was something more in the proposal than the right hon. Gentleman had yet indicated.

LORD R. CECIL hoped the Government would reconsider the point. He really could not understand their attitude. Surely the request put forward by the hon. Member for Burnley and others was reasonable, namely, that the Government should take the money they had got and apply it to a reasonable, rational, and logical scheme. The only answer the Chancellor of the Exchequer made was that they had tried all the schemes, and they could not find one that would cost less than £300,000 more than their present scheme. It was really incredible. It was impossible to believe that by an arrangement of the scale they could not bring out the sum substantially the same as that of the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman. He urged this on the Government, not only on the ground of thrift, but on the ground of justice. There would be a grave sense of injustice unless some such proposal were adopted. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that he was wrong in putting aside the claim of justice as he had so often done on this subject. The pensioner who having 9s. or 10s. a week got no more than the pensioner with 8s. would feel unjustly treated because he would be receiving a less pension from the State, and he would say "Why should I not have some advantage over the person who has only 8s. a week ?" It would leave a rankling sense of injustice in the minds of some people. No one in the course of the debate had said that the scheme of the Government was as just as that of the hon. Member for Hexham, and he hoped the Government would see their way to accept the principle of the scheme.

MR. ASQUITH said he should like, before a division was taken, to say two or three words on this subject, particularly in reply to some of his hon. friends. The question was whether the schedule which now appeared in the Bill, should be left out in order that there might be substituted for it one or another of the proposals submitted by various Members of the Committee. The schedule which appeared in the Bill was the schedule adopted by the Government at the suggestion of the hon. Member for Worcester. It followed precisely the principle which had been adopted in all other countries, including our Colony of New Zealand, which had dealt with this matter of old-age pensions, and he believed it was the experience of those countries and Colonies that the effect was not prejudicial. That was a *prima facie* justification for the Government when they departed from the fixed scale, and adopted the sliding scale, although he had never concealed his own opinion that in the long run there was a good deal to be said against the adoption of any sliding scale; but the overwhelming opinion of the House was in its favour, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer very wisely adopted it. What were the alternatives to the Government's proposal ? When they came to examine them, as they had been in the most unprejudiced way, by gentlemen more competent than any of them could be at a moment's notice, it was found that there was not one which in practice could be found to involve other than a substantially larger sum than the Government scheme. He made an exception of the scheme of the noble Lord the Member for Maidstone, which would give a substantially smaller sum. All the others would necessarily involve a substantially greater expenditure, and under those circumstances he must really appeal to the House to stand by the Government's proposal. He did so with the assurance that the Government would watch most carefully the practical operation of the scheme, when it became part of the law of the land, and if they found that it was productive of the grave practical inconveniences which some of his hon. friends forecasted, no one would be more ready than they to profit by the lessons of experience, and ask Parliament to remedy the inconveniences.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 209; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 171.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Asquith, Rt Hn. HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Black, Arthur W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt Hn. SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHn.Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.

Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards,Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,RtHn.Herbert John
Glen-Coats,Sir T. (Renfrew,W.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch,George Peabody (Bath)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,RtHn.L.(Rossendale)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.

Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col.Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lambert, George
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A. Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George,Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G. Croydon (Launceston
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan,Francis E.(Leitrim,N.)
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)

Morrell, Philip
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nicholls, George
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H.(Lincoln)
Roberts,Sir JohnH.(Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw,Rt.Hon.T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Sores, Ernest J.
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor,Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.
Thompson, JWH(S'merset,E.)
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Wadsworth, J.
Walters, John Tudor
Waring, Walter
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.SirThomas P.
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh, N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.

Tellers for the Ayes.—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.Sir AlexF.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury,Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H. T.(Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil,Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil,Lord R.(Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.JA. (Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Cleland, J. W.
Coates, Major E. F.(Lewisham)
Cochrane,Hon.Thos. H. A. E.
Cooper, G. J.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas,Rt.Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V.(Hants, W.)
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Gordon, J.
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haddock, George B.
Hardie,J Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Hope,John Deans (Fife, West)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kerry, Earl of
Lamb,Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lyttleton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
Maddison, Frederick
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Renton, Leslie
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorgeD.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)

Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, d) Mi
Wilkie, Alexander
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. Holt and Mr. Leif Jones.

Question proposed, "That this be the Schedule of the Bill."

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle) said before the Question was put to the Vote he desired to say a word or two against the schedule. That was the only method he had left by which to raise the Question that he had placed upon the Notice Paper. In objecting to the schedule being added to the Bill he thought they were acting in a perfectly consistent way, for every Member on those benches he believed voted against the deletion of the 5s. which the Government proposed in order to insert a schedule. But having decided that a schedule was to go into the Bill they thought a great injustice would be done to a large number of people who had had hopes raised by the Government that their pension would be 5s. a week, whereas now it was to be something less, according to the schedule. They felt that even though it might involve the Government in the task of finding more money, there was not sufficient justification for accepting any schedule that placed a number of the pensioners in a worse position than they would have been placed in had the Bill in its original form been carried into law. Therefore, they on those benches not only protested against the acceptance of a schedule that had that effect, but they were also prepared to carry their protest into the division lobby. The question would be put to him as it had been put to others who had attempted to amend the schedule in the direction of increased cost, namely, what was the actual cost it would involve. He did not know that any of them who took the responsibility of putting Amendments down had been in a position really to ascertain the exact amount involved in the proposals, but he had estimated that it would mean an increased cost of something like £2,000,000. That might seem a very large amount to add to the Government's estimate of a little over £7,000,000 for their scheme; but having regard to the immense possibilities for providing money that the country enjoyed, the increase would not impose an impossible task upon the Government. And seeing, as the hon. Member for North West Manchester had told the Committee, this would have to be done, and probably in a very short time, they felt that the Government in dealing with the question should deal with it on lines that would give greater satisfaction to a greater number of pensioners. They were very disappointed that the Government had accepted a schedule that would place such a large number of those in whom the Government had created hopes in a position much more disadvantageous to themselves than they would have been under the original Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 210 ; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 172.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashley, W. W.
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Black, Arthur W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton,Rt.Hn.Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clough, William
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Crossley, William J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Dewar, Arthur (Eninburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St.Pancras,N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gladstone,Rt Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guinness, Walter Edward
Harcourt,Rt Hn L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Lambert, George
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
McCallum, John M.
McCrae, Sir George
McKenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G. Croydon (Launceston
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim,N)
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrell, Philip
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rendall, Athelstan

Renton, Leslie
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walters, John Tudor
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn. Sir Thos. P.
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williamson, A.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart.
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barnes, G. N.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Cleland, J. W.
Cooper, G. J.
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haddock, George B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hills, J. W.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Joynson-Hicks, William
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
Moore, William
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. George Roberts and Mr. Charles Duncan.

Bill reported, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered this day (Tuesday), and to be printed. [Bill 295.]

NAVIGATION WORKS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged;

Bill withdrawn.

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock on Monday evening, Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at eighteen minutes after One o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 7th July, 1908.

VISCOUNT BOYNE.

Ordered, That the Report of the Lord Chancellor of the United Kingdom, made to the House of Lords on Monday last, that the right of the Viscount Boyne to vote at the elections of Representative Peers for Ireland has been established to his satisfaction, be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland, together with a certificate stating that such Report has been made, and that the House has ordered it to be sent to the said Clerk of the Crown in Ireland.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10); Marriages Provisional Order.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments.

Camborne Water Bill.—Reported without Amendment.

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cornwall, etc.) Bill [H.L.] (Swansea Orders No. 1 and No. 2).—Report from the Select Committee. That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the said Orders no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on 24th June last and the 1st instant respecting the commitment of the Bill to a Select Committee in regard to the said Orders discharged.

Garw and Ogmore Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made; Bill passed and returned to the Commons.

Swinton and Mexbrough Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; a further Amendment made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to.

Merthyr Tydvil Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to, with Amendments.

Stockport Corporation Bill; Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill; Southwell District Gas Bill; Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill; Seaham Harbour Dock Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES: ANNUAL.

No. 563. Gibraltar (Report for 1907).

TRADE REPORTS: MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 668. Japan (Report on the Hok Kaido).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PHARMACY (IRELAND) ACTS, 1875 AND 1890.

Order in Council, dated 3rd July, 1908, approving of a regulation made by the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT (IRELAND), 1877.

Order in Council, dated 3rd July, 1908, giving effect to Rules of Court.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (CITY OF EXETER).

Order made by the Council of the City of Exeter, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE SITES BILL [H.L.].

Reported, with Amendments and re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS (MASTERS) BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE **LORD STEWARD** (Earl BEAUCHAMP): My Lords, this is really a Departmental Bill, of, I think I may say without exaggeration, an agreed character. Questions have arisen from time to time as to the power of the Board of Education to insert in schemes relating to endowed schools a provision for giving notice to the headmasters and assistant masters employed in the schools to which the schemes relate. The matter was much discussed in the case of Wright *v.* Zetland (Marquess of) [1908] 1 K.B. 63; and this Bill is really in consequence of the proceedings which took place on that occasion.

The question is not a very material one in regard to headmasters, but the Bill deals more particularly with assistant masters. Your Lordships will see that by Clause 1 the employer is made the governing body. There was some question before that action as to whether the assistant masters were not in the employment of the headmaster, who had technically engaged them, but as headmasters are not generally men of much means, I think your Lordships will see that it would be rather unfair that the assistant masters should be in their employment rather than in that of the governing body of the school. The second subsection provides that—

> "Notwithstanding anything in Section 22 of the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, any provision in any scheme, whether made before or after the passing of this Act, providing for notice being given to a master before he is dismissed from office, shall have full effect."

This provision will prevent the Bill interfering with the particular circumstances of any special scheme. The third subsection provides that, subject to any other special provision, an assistant master shall have at least two months notice. That is agreed upon as being a reasonable period. Finally, subsection (4) allows an assistant master to be dismissed without notice for misconduct or other good and urgent cause, in spite of any thing contained in this Bill.

The Bill in its present form represents the result of long negotiations which have taken place between the Board of Education and the Incorporated Association of Headmasters, and a similar Association of Assistant Masters, and it is understood to have the support of both these bodies and of other persons interested in the question. I think I ought to mention that the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters have pressed upon the Board of Education a demand for the introduction of legislation that should confer on them absolute security of tenure, or, in the alternative, security of tenure subject to appeal to the Board. The Board have not seen their way to agree to such a proposal, because they think that no Department of State could usefully assume the position of arbitrator in such matters. The Association of Assistant Masters have been informed of this decision. They have expressed themselves as satisfied, and have foregone any further demands in this direction.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

THE MARQUESS OF **SALISBURY**: My Lords, I do not think there is any disposition on this side of the House to resist this Bill, certainly not the Second Reading of it. With regard to what has just been said by the noble Earl, we are disposed to agree with him that at any rate in the first instance, it would be far better not to proceed further than the provisions in the Bill. It will be time enough to judge, after the Act has been in operation some little time, whether sufficient security has been given to the masters under its provisions before any fresh legislation is introduced giving an appeal to the Board of Education such as was mentioned by the noble Earl. There are two matters to which I should like to refer. I presume the intention of the first subsection of Clause 1 is that if an assistant master has reason to complain of action taken against him he will sue the governing body rather than the headmaster.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: Yes.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I have no doubt, speaking quite off-hand and without committing oneself too far, that that is a proper provision. As to the second subsection, I am surprised that the Government have not proposed to repeal Section 22 of the Endowed Schools Act, 1869. That section absolutely prohibits a scheme from containing any other provision except that of dismissal at pleasure, so that as it stands upon the Statute-book Section 22 of that Act is absolutely in the teeth of the policy of this Bill. That being so, perhaps the best course would be to repeal the section before the Bill is finished with in your Lordships' House. I submit that suggestion for the consideration of the Government.

On Question, Bill read 2^a (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Thursday next.

BOARD OF TRADE (PROVISIONAL ORDERS) BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD HAMILTON OF DALZELL: My Lords, this is a Bill which requires a few words of explanation. Its object is to enable the Board of Trade to make rules as to procedure for obtaining and granting Provisional Orders. This power of granting Provisional Orders has been exercised by the Board of Trade for a number of years. The Board was first given power to make Provisional Orders in regard to piers and harbours in the year 1861, and with regard to tramways and to the supply of gas and water in 1870, and the latest powers were given under the Supply of Electricity Act in 1882.

This Bill does not enlarge the powers with regard to the scope of these Provisional Orders; it merely enables the Board to make rules as to the procedure to be adopted. Its object is to remove certain difficulties which have arisen from the fact that the older Acts of Parliament lay down the exact procedure which is to be adopted. That is not the case in the newer Act—the Electric Lighting Act—as I will explain in a moment. This fact has caused a considerable amount of inconvenience. As an example of this inconvenience I may quote the case of the date on which the draft Provisional Orders have to be deposited. That is fixed at 23rd December. I believe that a similar date was originally fixed by the Standing Orders in the case of Private Bills before Parliament, but that date was found to be most inconvenient, and Parliament altered the Standing Order accordingly. The Board of Trade, however, have no power to alter a thing of that kind without coming to Parliament in each instance and it is with the object of conferring such a power that this Bill is introduced.

Several other inconveniences arise, and I may quote one in the fact that under the Piers and Harbours Act a period of fourteen days must elapse after the deposit or advertisement of the Order before the confirming Bill can be introduced. In the case of gas, water, and tramways this period is only seven days. Of course, it is inconvenient that these periods should be different, and in the case of electric power and electric light Bills, no such interval is found to be necessary at all. I will give one more instance. Great expense is caused by a provision in regard to gas, water, and tramway Provisional Orders to the effect that the Provisional Order has to be published in extenso in the local newspaper, whereas with regard to other Orders, it has been found sufficient to insert a notice stating that the Order has been made and where copies of it may be obtained. The Board of Trade have had strong representations made to them that the cost of Provisional Orders has very often deterred the owners of non-statutory gas companies, for instance, from coming to Parliament and having their undertaking put upon a proper legal footing.

The Electric Lighting Act of 1882 confers powers on the Board of Trade for making rules and regulations with regard to the application for Provisional Orders, to the payments to be made in respect of them, to the publication of notices and advertisements, and to the manner of making objections and holding local inquiries. It is proposed by this Bill to extend a similar power to the Board of Trade in respect of the other matters with regard to which they are empowered to make Provisional Orders. These rules will have to be laid before Parliament and will have statutory force, and, of course, they may be amended by a similar procedure—that is to say, by Amendments being laid before Parliament. I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hamilton of Dalzell.*)

Lord ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I am sure that after the very clear statement made by the noble Lord there will be no desire in any part of the House to interpose any obstacles or delays. The only observation that occurs to me in reference to the matter is this, that it is obvious that this Bill makes the Board of Trade supreme with regard to the important matters referred to it by Act of Parliament. I do not at all say that the Board of Trade are thinking for a moment of abusing their powers, but it is a very serious thing to transfer from Parliament, with all its facilities for examination, revision and inquiry, these powers to one of the Government Departments. It is an important matter to hand over to the Board supreme power in consenting to the making of tramways, for we know that a railway company may be ruined through a tramway being run along near it so as to intercept and tap, and, it may be, destroy its traffic. I do not know whether that would be a matter which the Board of Trade would be taking power by this Bill to deal with. I am quite sure that they have not the slightest intention of doing anything that is not absolutely right and proper, and I merely mention it as an illustration of the powers that may be exercised under the Bill. I am sure that the objects of the measure are to simplify procedure and save expense, and I hope the noble Lord will allow a few days to elapse before taking the next stage, in order that those who are interested may have an opportunity of examining closely the changes the Bill proposes to effect.

Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL: I will certainly put the next stage of the Bill down for a few days hence, so as to allow the interval for which the noble and learned Lord has asked. I think, however, that he has exaggerated the possible effects of the measure. It deals with rules of procedure as to the lodging of notices, etc., and it has not the far-reaching scope which the noble and learned Lord seems to think.

On Question, Bill read 2ª (according to order), and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

DISTURBED AREAS IN IRELAND.

Lord KILLANIN: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government the Questions standing in my name on the Paper—namely, by whose authority and on what principle are the districts selected which are charged with the expenses of extra forces of the Royal Irish Constabulary in proclaimed parts of Ireland; and whether accounts of such expenses can be transmitted to the secretaries of county councils at such times as will enable county councils to consider them in connection with their annual estimates; and to call attention especially to a demand for over £3,000 recently sent to the Galway County Council, and made chargeable on the county at large; and also to ask for a Return showing in the case of each proclaimed county in Ireland: (1) The number of officers and men of the Royal Irish Constabulary actually in each county at the end of March, 1905; (2) the number of officers and men wholly chargeable out of the Consolidated Fund for each county; (3) the number of officers and men extra of the establishment in each county and their expenses for each half-year from the end of March, 1905, to the end of March, 1908; (4) the sums demanded in these counties for the expense of conveying prisoners in each half-year from the end of March, 1905, to the end of March, 1908; (5) the amount of compensation for malicious injuries granted in these counties in each half-year from March, 1905, to March, 1908.

In asking for this information and for this Return, I should like to make a few remarks, with the object of, if possible, drawing public attention, and especially public attention in Ireland, to what is occurring in connection with this matter. The most important part of my Questions refers to the subject of the large extra expenditure being incurred in certain parts of Ireland at the present moment, and, in connection with that, the heavy taxation which is being imposed. This extra expenditure is being incurred on account of the large bodies of additional police that are being drafted to certain districts. The extra taxation comes about also owing to the fact that there has been an increase in the number of cases of malicious injury and in the bill for the conveyance of prisoners. This large expenditure, and consequent heavy taxation, is, to my mind, a very serious matter, and it is about to become even more so in the future. It is due to the fact that in certain parts of Ireland, unfortunately, the districts are in a disturbed condition, and it is due, in a still larger degree, to the cumbrous, circuitous, expensive, unjust, and wholly ineffectual mode of dealing with these disturbances which has been adopted by His Majesty's Government.

I say that the mode of dealing with this state of affairs adopted by His Majesty's Government is cumbrous and circuitous. What is the position? Cattle-driving and other forms of agrarian outrage are very prevalent in certain parts of Ireland, and instead of dealing directly, determinedly, and firmly with the matter, the Government, in spite of their oft-repeated declaration that they would carry on the government of Ireland by the ordinary law of the land, have reconciled that decision, by some interpretation that I cannot follow, with having recourse to the despotic and arbitrary clauses of an old Act of the reign of William IV. By Section 13 of that Act the Lord-Lieutenant can, by proclamation, declare that any county, county of a city, or county of a town in Ireland, or any barony or half-barony, or any district of less extent than a barony or half-barony are in a state of disturbance and require an additional establishment of police; and by other provisions of that Act the Lord-Lieutenant can draft police into those districts, and can direct that half the expense thereof is to be borne by the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom and half by local taxation. Under Section 13 the Lord-Lieutenant has, of his own sweet will, proclaimed certain areas in Ireland; he has drafted immense numbers of police into those districts, and great extra expense has been incurred; and this in spite of the fact that the Government have declared that they would carry on the government of Ireland by the ordinary law. Does the noble Lord, who will answer me, consider that having recourse to the Act of William IV. is carrying on the government by the ordinary law of the land? Or is it not a farce and fiction to say that the government of Ireland is being carried on at the present moment under the ordinary law?

Assuming that this is governing Ireland according to the ordinary law, the next question that arises is: Is this mode of dealing with the matter proving effectual? Are the extra police that are being poured into these districts doing much, or any, good? I regret to have to say that, in spite of this, outrages are continuing to take place, and are actually increasing. Outrages take place in close proximity to crowded police barracks, and it is usual to read at the end of reports of such occurrences that no arrest has been made. If arrests are made no conviction follows; and the evil doers in these parts of the country have come to the conclusion that, notwithstanding the increased number of police, they can safely anticipate that they will not be detected and arrested, and that, if they are arrested, they will not be punished. So much for whether this mode of dealing with the matter is proving effectual.

The noble Lord who represents the Irish Office may say that although the method pursued by the Government is not directly effectual, it will prove indirectly effectual through the local taxation which these expenses will involve, and that the increased taxation will deter people from continuing in these evil courses, or will, at any rate, punish them. So far as it merely punishes them and is merely revengeful, I take no interest in the matter. I only take an interest in punishment if it deters people from following evil courses. Further, I may say that personally, and especially in reference to Ireland, I am no admirer of this way of punishing districts by taxation. Ireland is already over-taxed. These poor districts can badly afford any additional taxation, and I think it is deplorable, if there are any extra means that can be raised on the rates, or if there is any financial assistance to be given to these districts out of the Consolidated Fund, that the money should be spent in this wasteful and useless fashion and not retained for other beneficent objects to which it might be applied.

Again, I think that this form of punishment by taxation acts very unfairly. It punishes the many innocent people in those districts just as much as the few guilty ones, and the latter do not feel that they are suffering any extra punishment over the innocent. The only chance that that form of dealing with the difficulty would have of proving effectual would be if the taxation were confined to the districts in which the outrages had occurred, and into which the additional police had been drafted. But that is not so. I have not the statistics of all the counties in Ireland, but I have those of County Galway, and I can show that it is the policy of the Government not to confine this taxation to the districts affected but to spread it over large areas that have no connection whatever with the outrages and are wholly blameless in the matter. In County Galway—I am a member of the county council, and therefore familiar with all these matters—in the last three years, for example, over £13,000 has been called for in respect of extra police. It has been gradually growing. For the half-year ended 31st March last year the total extra expense was £889; for the half-year ended 30th September last the total extra expense had risen to £2,349. So much for whether the method pursued by the Government is effectual. The more police that are put into a district the more crime; and I find that in the half-year ended 31st March last the extra expense for police was £6,000. I am told that for the next half-year, half of which has already passed, it will be something like £8,000; so that £14,000 will have been spent in one year for extra police.

With reference to the area of levy, when these demands were first sent to the county council they were allotted to certain district councils and even to certain town land where the expenses had been incurred. So far so good. Taxation so imposed might have had a punitive value. But recently the authorities in Dublin have ordered that the area of taxation shall be largely the county, and we were directed to levy the most recent demand—one for £3,000—over the county at large, thereby wholly depriving this taxation of its punitive value. I wish to point out how very unjust that is. Galway is a very large county, and on the side where I live there are none of these disturbances; the people are all small peasant farmers, who are wholly blameless in reference to these disturbances. No extra police are required in these districts, and not alone have we got no extra police but we are actually denuded of our own share in order that they may be drafted to other districts. I maintain that this is monstrously unjust and even tragic when you think of the various parts of Ireland which are composed of congested districts, and that at this very moment, in the county of Galway, which has put into operation a section of the Local Government Act, we are taxing ourselves for this purpose, although a certain part of the community are actually dying of starvation. I mean to say it is perfectly monstrous to include these districts where these outrages do not take place in the taxation, apart from the fact that it wholly deprives this Act of its punitive force.

There is only one other point I wish to mention—a small point but not without importance—with reference to the procedure of the county council. In former days, if any charges were incurred under this Act, the account was sent twice a year, because the Grand Jury met twice a year, and struck a rate twice a year, whereas now, although the county councils still meet half-yearly, they only strike a rate once a year, and it is impossible to meet these demands anyhow if they are sent after the Estimates are considered and the rates struck, when we have no floating balance out of which to meet this large item of £3,000 or £4,000. I would therefore ask the Government to say that they will send these demands early in the year—generally about February, when we strike the rate—so that the matter can be considered, and above all I ask them to see that the area of applotment is justly and properly chosen.

LORD DENMAN: The noble Lord (Lord Killanin) speaks, of course, with very considerable authority on this particular question. Being himself a member of the Galway County Council I have no doubt that he has a very intimate knowledge of these matters, and, naturally, any views which he puts forward will receive the careful attention of the Government. I am certainly not surprised that he views with some alarm the considerable charge of some £3,000 that is put upon the county council of Galway for the extra police which it has been found necessary to draft into the district, and though I have not the advantage of his local knowledge I shall certainly not be prepared to deny that this is rather a rough and ready method of enforcing justice. At the same time, my Lords, it is also impossible to deny that this is part of the ordinary law of the land which is on the Statute-book. Irish counties have been proclaimed by both Parties in the State several times in recent years, and therefore if he asked me across the floor of the House, I should say, of course, that this is part of the ordinary law of the land. The noble Lord complains of the despotic powers which are given under this Act. I can only repeat that this Act has been enforced very many times by both Parties in the State in recent years, and certainly His Majesty's Government do not contemplate any alteration in the law at the present time. The noble Lord asks in his Question by whose authority these districts are selected, but I gathered from his speech that that was rather a rhetorical form of question, because I think he himself supplied the answer—that it was upon the authority of the Statute of William IV.

LORD KILLANIN: Upon what principle, I also asked.

LORD DENMAN: I will come to that directly. And also under Statutes 9 and 10 Vict., c. 97, Section 5, and 11 and 12 Vict., c. 72, Section 6, one moiety of the cost of such additional police is chargeable to the county at large to which the police are appointed. As noble Lords from Ireland are well aware, last year it was found necessary to proclaim six of these counties, and this year—last month, I think—the counties of Sligo and Westmeath were also proclaimed, and in each of these cases the entire county, as has generally, I believe, been the practice, was declared by the proclamation to be in a state of disturbance. The noble Lord appeared to be under the impression that we could declare a smaller portion of the county in a state of disturbance, and that is so, but you must rate the whole county for the extra charge of police, even though you only declare a small area or a small portion of that county to be in a state of disturbance. The opinion of the law officers of the Crown——

LORD KILLANIN: In many of the demands sent to us they, as a matter of fact, only directed us to levy the rate for certain portions of the county. If it is as the noble Lord now says, the procedure has only been quite recently changed, and things must have been done very irregularly during the last three years.

LORD DENMAN: I am afraid I cannot explain that fact; I can only state that the opinion of the law officers of the Crown has recently been taken on this point, and they are quite clear that the law is as I have just told the House. Then the noble Lord has raised the particular question of the county of Galway. Last year both the East Riding and the West Riding of the County of Galway were in a state of disturbance.

LORD KILLANIN: Not the West Riding.

LORD DENMAN: It is true parts of the West Riding, as I am informed, were certainly in a very much better condition than other parts of the county, and were possibly not in a state of disturbance at all. I will not argue that question, but I wish to point out that as long ago as August of last year monthly returns were sent to the county council in order to give them some idea of the expenditure they would have to meet. The county council estimates for the rest of the ensuing year are prepared compulsorily for that period, and the county council had full means, before striking their rates, of estimating the amount of the charge for which they would be liable for the half-year ending 30th September, 1908. I am informed that the monthly reports were sent to the county council. As a matter of fact, the secretaries of county councils are in possession by 31st January of each year of accounts for extra police covering a full year up to the end of the previous September. And then I have to meet the point which the noble Lord has raised—it has happened and I take it it will happen, that extra police may be drafted into a county after the rate has been struck, and it may so happen that the county council have not the current funds to meet that charge immediately. In that case the Government will be prepared to consider any reasonable demand for time for the county to pay the rate in question. The Government have no information—at any rate, no detailed information—with regard to the state of the finances of the county council of Galway and their ability or otherwise to meet this charge, but as I have endeavoured to show, the council had pretty good reason to anticipate the charge when their rates for the year were struck. But if the county council can advance any sufficient reason why there should be some delay in enforcing the charge, the Government will give the case careful consideration before deducting the amount of £3,000 odd, I think it is, which, as the noble Lord is aware, they are empowered to do by Act of Parliament from the Local Taxation Grant.

Then the noble Lord asks for a Return of police in the case of each proclaimed county. This Return was asked for, I think, at the end of last week, and I had hoped that I should have been enabled to give it to the noble Lord to-day, but I trust that he will be content if I promise him that the Return for which he asks will be given to him at a very early date—I hope some day this week.

*LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I suppose the answer that has just been given by the noble Lord (Lord Denman) is in accordance with the official information in the Irish Office, and that he could not add to it without inconvenience. But all these discussions and questions that come up in reference to Ireland raise very painful thoughts in the mind of anyone who is in the slightest degree interested in that country. One has only to think of the Questions that have been asked so quietly in this House, and just replied to, to enable one, with very slight effort, to realise the very grave state of things existing in Ireland at the present moment. It is extremely serious, and to anyone—it does not require that he should be an Irishman—to anyone interested in the welfare of any part of the United Kingdom it is most distressing knowledge. One has only to open *The Times*, or any other of the papers of the day, and read the charges of the Judges who are now going upon circuit, in order to see the painful and the singularly distressing state of several of the counties of Ireland—the lawlessness that is too rampant in many places, the outrages that are but too often unchecked, too often unpunished, and the perpetrators of which have not been found, imprisoned, or checked. It has been pointed out that this is not a thing of yesterday or to-day; it has been going on for a long time. There was a lull some months ago, but that lull has ceased, and again I have to remind your Lordships you have only to read each day in the paper the charges of the Judges who are now going on circuit to see what is the state of the facts. It was pointed out to the present Government—they did not need it to be pointed out, for they knew it—that there was a statute, not of Edward III. or William IV., but a statute of twenty-one years ago which they always call the Coercion Act, but which is really called "An Act for the Prevention of Crime in Ireland." It is there to their hand. Clause after clause of that Act finds its counterpart in the laws of Scotland. But the Government will not apply it, although their attention has been drawn to it over and over again. The noble Earl opposite who is now the Leader of the House (the Earl of Crewe) indicated last year that he was conscious of it, but that he did not think the time had come to put it in force. Well, I do not know who does their thinking for them, but at all events there is the Act, and they will not apply the Act. They have the means of applying the remedy, and they will not apply it. The Chief Secretary hammered the box in the other House as if he was invoking the Twelve Apostles to witness his rectitude, and said: "I will not do it"—and he looked round for applause and got it. One would have thought he was asking some great Heavenly Power to witness that he was not going to break the Ten Commandments. Really he was asking for witness that he would not apply the laws which were ready to his hand for the obtaining of peace and quiet in Ireland.

What is the state of things in regard to the Question of my noble friend Lord Killanin? The Government will not apply an obvious remedy, but they search about for statutes in the Statute-book (one of them in the reign of Edward III.) which in many of their provisions are more arbitrary than the Act of 1887, and they have applied the provisions of the other Act referred to by my noble friend, declaring certain counties in Ireland disturbed, and have added the extra police. What does that mean? That they will not apply the statute framed for the very purpose of preserving law and order in Ireland, but that they have to go back centuries to find an Act to help them to do the same thing. Then they fall back on another statute, and they declare that there are seven or eight counties in Ireland in a disturbed state. That is serious enough, and it leads to great expense, because the declaration of its being in a disturbed state, as I gather, is a necessary preliminary to justify the Government in adding to the police in the district, and they have had to increase the police by a very considerable extent, at a cost of thousands upon thousands of pounds.

Then my noble friend mentioned the element of malicious injuries—a very grave and serious element which exists in Ireland, and if it did not exist in Ireland, it would be more serious still—that in reference to these unfortunate people who have been subjected to the outrage of cattle-driving and other outrages, some much more grave, there is a provision which enables them to apply to get claims for malicious injuries from the County Court Judges. That enables them to be partially recouped the money loss which they have sustained, but it unfortunately entails upon the County Court Judge the disagreeable task that has arrested the attention of my noble friend Lord Killanin, of applotting upon districts the money for the payment of these malicious injuries. That is a very serious and grave state of things. I am aware that often the applotment of the payment of that money must fall upon innocent people, and that those who have committed the injuries and the outrages have to pay nothing. Very likely their fathers and uncles have to pay, but the particular perpetrators of the outrages I venture to say too often escape. My noble friend has drawn attention to that which is a serious matter—the applotment of the expenses of the police—but as I gather from the noble Lord, Lord Denman, who has spoken on behalf of the Irish Government, they are following the statutory requirements of the Acts of Parliament

I assume that to be so from what he says, though Lord Killanin indicates that until recently the applotment was somewhat of a different character from what has been lately applied.

My Lords, in all these discussions it is right to note the living present in which we live. It is painful to reflect that at this time of day, after so many discussions have taken place and so many questions have been asked in the House of Commons—which were resented very much at one time, but are not so much referred to now in terms of censure—that at this time of day, with all the resources which are at the disposal of the Irish Government and the Chief Secretary, matters should be in such a state as that. There are many counties in Ireland declared to be in a disturbed state, and the police force has to be largely increased, thousands of pounds have to be paid for malicious injuries, and all the time the law is so administered that crime is rampant in many places, that outrages may be read of constantly in the papers, to be followed by the statement mentioned by my noble friend, that no arrests have been made. My Lords, it is a very painful and serious state of facts; it would be impossible to allow any question to be asked in reference to Ireland without drawing attention to some of the circumstances of the case, and that is why I have ventured to trouble your Lordships with these few words.

*THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, I quite agree with everything that the noble and learned Lord (Lord Ashbourne) has said. The fact of the matter is that those who live in Ireland, like myself, have to put up at present with this state of affairs, because we have been told—and by the Lord Chancellor on the Woolsack—that coercion—that is to say, the Coercion Act—will not be put in force. Given that state of affairs, I must deal with the question that Lord Killanin has put. The point that he made was that, instead of the districts being charged for the police that were put in the county, the county at large is charged. Now, my Lords, if the district is applotted by the Judge for the charges incurred by reason of malicious injuries, the people around there who, it is no secret to us, although the police do not know it, are well aware of what has taken place, if the people are charged they must pay, but in the case of police being put on the county at large, the districts where the cattle-driving takes place are not necessarily affected at all. As Lord Killanin very properly pointed out, the County Galway is divided by a large lake, and on one side there is a great deal of this bad business going on, while on the other side there is none, and why on earth, if you want to keep law and order in the country should not the common-sense principle be adopted which is adopted by the Judges in the case of malicious injuries—that the districts where the police find there is cattle-driving should have to pay for the expense of those police?

The noble Lord, Lord Denman, said that the Government would give careful consideration to some minor points about the expenses of the county council—as to how they were to be sent in. I forget exactly what it was, but it was some quite minor point. I wish they would give careful consideration to the great point, because Lord Killanin very carefully stated that the authorities in Dublin now insist upon taxation being put on the whole county, although formerly the taxation was put upon the districts. I ask your Lordships, is any good likely to come of this form of dealing with this outrage—I will not use the word outrage, but call it cattle-driving. Is there any good likely to come of this form of dealing with cattle-driving if the district is not to be charged for it? We are not to have coercion—we are under a Government which will not have coercion, and I suppose we have got to sit under it and exist under it; but as for the whole county being charged for it when you have that county divided by a large inland sea, this seems to me perfectly ridiculous, and not common sense. Lord Killanin pointed out that in many cases, and in very poor districts, there were quite innocent people wholly unable to bear these charges. I only put to the Government the common sense point of view. Why should they not do what has been done before?

Now as to the rate. Lord Killanin said it was formerly the custom to strike the rate twice a year in counties, but now it is the custom to strike the rate once a year only, and in consequence of that the county council are put to great difficulties because, as the noble Lord said, the police might be sent down at any moment after the rate is struck without any notice whatever. That the Irish Government have a perfect right to do. But after all, let us go on the principle of live and let live, and instead of the sort of answer that the Irish Office give—that they will give careful consideration to a minor point with regard to a small business of a parochial character—I wish they would give careful consideration to the point I have made with regard to the districts and the counties at large. The noble Lord said he could not give very much information upon that point. I shall have the pleasure, with your Lordships' leave, of raising the question again, or some noble friends of mine will do so, because, as I said before, we have got to live under this *regime*, and we want to live under it as quietly as possible under the circumstances.

LORD KILLANIN: Might I, with your Lordship's permission, make a few remarks which may somewhat elucidate matters? I understand the noble Lord (Lord Denman) to say that although the Lord-Lieutenant can proclaim portions of counties, he cannot allot the taxation to portions of counties. Does he say that that is the legal position in the matter, and that, therefore, the authorities are bound to put it upon the county at large? If so, that does not fit in with the facts. I have the Returns here for the last three years. For the half-year ending 30th September, 1905, I have the number of districts in the County of Galway all enumerated, leaving out certain districts; for the half-year ending 31st March, 1906, it was the same; for the half-year ending 30th September, 1906, it was also off districts and even off townlands, there were certain small townlands mentioned, and for the first time a small portion of the taxation was put upon the county at large. The next half-year, to 31st March, 1907, again it was put on townlands, and a portion off the county at large. Yet the noble Lord says they can be put upon the county at large. And for the half-year to the 30th September, 1907, again it was on various townlands, various districts, and a certain portion off the county at large. But for the half-year ending 31st March of this present year the total is put on the county at large for the first time. Therefore, for two and a half years they have been putting it on townlands and districts of which I highly approve, and what I object to is that they have not gone on doing that. I cannot see how the legal view he gives fits in with the facts, which facts have occurred under the administration of the present Law Officers. Have they suddenly grown wise, or what? With reference to the legal matter, might I refer the noble Lord to Section 8 of 2 and 3 Vict., c. 35, and 9 and 10 Vict. c. 97, because I think under those two sections the Law Officers have been acting, and under those it is perfectly within their power to applot the charge to the particular districts.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): We have not the advantage in this House of having any lawyer from Ireland officially assisting us, although I see two noble and learned Lords opposite who must be well acquainted with the state of the law. What my noble friend behind me (Lord Denman) understood to be the case was that the Act of William IV.—I think the Act of 1836—is the Act by which the extra police are allocated to the different counties, but by the subsequent Act—I think of 1847 or 1848—the charge is obliged to be placed on the county as a whole, and not on the district. If that is so, how the facts occur to which the noble Lord opposite (Lord Killanin) has drawn attention I confess I do not understand, and it appears to me that it would be best if the noble Lord would put that Question down for another day, when my noble friend behind me will be supplied with the legal information.

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 7th July, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Briton Ferry Urban District Council Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time; and ordered to be considered upon Thursday.

Provisional Order Bills.—Ordered, that so much of Standing Order 73 as provides that notice of the day on which a Bill for confirming any Provisional Order will be examined shall not be given until after the Bill has been printed and circulated, be suspended for the remainder of the session.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bognor Gas Light and Coke Company Bill [Lords]; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill [Lords]; Aire and Calder Navigation Bill [Lords]; Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction, Evesham, Redditch, and Stratford-upon-Avon Junction, and East and West Junction Railways (Amalgamation) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill [Lords]; Northern Assurance Company Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Barry Railway Bill.—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill, without Amendment; Finchley Urban District Council Bill; Motherwell Burgh Extension, etc., Bill, with Amendments.

Amendment to:—North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill [Lords].

Amendments to:—Upton Town Hall Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1907, to enable the London County Council to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts." [Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a certain Provisional Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the rural district of Rathdown (No, 1)." [Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords].

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 302.]

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 303.]

PETITIONS.

LEASEHOLDS ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

Petition from Pembroke, in favour, to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petition from Forest of Dean, against to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour: From Bootle (three); Efailisaf; Glanadda; Ledbury; Islington; Knotty Ash; Mount Sorrel; Maiden Newton; Pontypridd; and Upper Clapton; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING ARRANGEMENTS (PARLIAMENTARY BOROUGHS) BILL.

Petition from Westminster against to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Auchterarder; and Thurso; to lie upon the Table.

PORT OF LONDON BILL.

Petition from Heston and Isleworth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Miscellaneous Series, No. 668 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IMPERIAL REVENUE (COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE) (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 30th March; *Mr. Joseph Pease*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 215.]

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 30th March; *Mr. John O'Connor*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 216.]

PHARMACY ACTS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Order in Council, dated 3rd July, 1908, approving of a Regulation made by the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1877.

Copy presented, of Order in Council, dated 3rd July, 1908, giving effect to Rules of Court [by Act] to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report No. 563 (Gibraltar, Annual Report for 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations for the Training of Teachers of Domestic Subjects (in force from 1st August, 1908) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ROADS AND BRIDGES (SCOTLAND).

Return ordered, "showing the rate per pound of assessment levied for Roads and Bridges by County Councils in each county or district of a county in Scotland in each year from 1891–2 to 1907–8, inclusive."—(*Mr. Erskine.*)

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (COLONIAL PENSIONS).

Address for "Return of the number of Members of the present House of Lords and of the present House of Commons who are in receipt of Pensions for service in the Colonies from Colonial funds."—(*Mr. Cooper.*)

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Paper [presented 23rd June] to be printed. [No. 214.]

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the City of Exeter, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Inefficient Crew of Steamer "Stowford."

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that when a

British steamer, the "Stowford," left the Tyne on 23rd May, the whole of the British crew on Board were helplessly drunk, and that the managing owner of the steamer, who happened to be on board, had to take the wheel himself and steer the ship over the bar; whether he is aware that the owners of the ship in question had refused to pay the recognised port rate of wages, and sought the assistance of the agents of the Shipping Federation and certain seamen's boarding-house keepers to procure a crew; whether he is aware that the crew were engaged on board ship instead of at the Mercantile Marine Office, and the crew complained of consisted entirely of foreigners, who at the time of engagement failed to produce certificates to prove they were seamen; and whether he will cause a full inquiry to be made in this matter with a view to taking proceedings against the owner and master under Section 457 of the Merchant Shipping Act for sending and taking the vessel to sea in an unseaworthy condition in consequence of the helpless state of the crew through drink.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) My attention has been called to a newspaper report of this case. I am informed that the crew were sober when they signed articles, but that some of them appeared to be under the influence of drink when the vessel sailed. I am also informed that one of the owners was on board and sailed with the ship, and that the seamen and firemen were engaged at £4 per month, the current rate at the port being £4 10s., but the owners state that it is not the fact that they refused to pay the recognised port wages. I understand that the men were engaged through the Shipping Federation. Of twenty-three hands all told, twelve were engaged on board the ship, eight members of the crew were foreigners, and five did not produce discharge certificates; but seven of the crew have again sailed in the ship, which seems to show that the master was satisfied as to their qualifications. I will take legal advice and consider whether the case is, or is not one, for action under Section 457 of the Merchant Shipping Act.

Construction of a Railway Station at Meenbanid.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he has received a petition from a number of inhabitants of the district urging the construction of a station at Meenbanid, on the Burtonport-Letterkenny Line; whether he is aware that the working company have agreed to maintain the station and furnish half the cost of construction, provided that the Treasury will agree to contribute the other half out of their portion of the receipts of the line; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Hobhouse.*) The Answer to the first two parts of the Question is in the affirmative. I have given this matter my careful consideration, but I regret that I do not see any sufficient reason for a contribution from public funds. No doubt the hon. Member recollects the reply which was given to a similar Question of his addressed to the Financial Secretary of the Treasury on the 16th March, 1906.

Date of Indian Budget Debate.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he can now state when the Indian Budget will be taken.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) It is hoped that the Indian Budget will be taken about 22nd July, but I fear it is impossible at present definitely to fix a date.

Irish Firms and Government Contracts.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state the names of the Irish firms which secured the contracts for head-dresses £1,000, mail bags £1,200, and cycle parts £1,500, spent in Ireland during 1907–8.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am sorry to find that I was in error in telling the hon. Member that £1,000 was spent in Ireland on head-dresses in 1907–8. The fact is that only one Irish firm responded to the invitation to tender and their tender was received too late.

The head-dresses were supplied from England. The mail-bags were made by prison labour and the £1,200 paid to the Irish Prisons Board. The £1,500 for bicycle parts, etc., was spent locally in small sums by postmasters and engineers.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that Irish manufacturers are practically precluded from tendering for Post Office stores by reason of the fact that they are obliged to send such stores to London for inspection, thus necessitating the employment of agents to look after their interests; and whether, in view of public opinion in Ireland, he will state what steps he proposes to take.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I stated on 9th August last, in reply to the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division of Dublin, that, as regards certain stores, tenders were for delivery in Dublin. I am not aware of any necessity for the employment of agents even when Irish manufacturers deliver goods in London. The supply of linen linings for uniforms, for instance, is practically monopolised by firms in Ireland, but no difficulty rendering the employment of a London agent necessary has ever arisen.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he proposes to act on the recommendations of the Hobhouse Committee that increased powers should be delegated to the Dublin Office; and, if so, whether he will include in such powers the right to arrange for contracts for Irish stores without the intervention of London officials, subject to the restriction that the cost must not be greater than that of the same articles in England.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The question of delegation of powers to the local secretaries in Scotland and Ireland and to the surveyors and postmasters is under the consideration of a Departmental Committee. I should not, in any case, be willing to divest myself of the personal control which I exercise over the conditions and allocation of the more important store contracts.

Tea Imports.

MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what were the quantities of tea imported into the United Kingdom during the past financial year from British Possessions and foreign countries respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The quantities of tea imported into the United Kingdom during the past financial year from British Possessions and foreign countries respectively were as follows:—

	Lbs.
British Possessions	277,860,575
Foreign countries	39,204,745
Total	317,065,320

Pensions of Naval Officers' Stewards and Cooks.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): To ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that officers' stewards and cooks have been granted the substantive rank of chief and petty officers, their Lordships have now under consideration the granting to this class of similar pensions to those of other chief and petty officers.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) This matter was fully considered at the time when the substantive rank was granted, and the Board of Admiralty did not feel themselves justified in incurring the heavy cost the proposal would entail.

Farmers' Co-operative Societies.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) how much was spent in 1907 by the Government in Ireland in furthering the principle of co-operation among farmers; how many farmers' co-operative societies now exist there; and whether they are on the increase.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) The expenditure of the Department in the calender year, 1907, in connection with the purpose referred to, was £4,313 7s. 7d. This sum was paid to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society and included the special expenses of organising agricultural credit societies formed in the western districts of Ireland to borrow moneys for the purchase of seeds. The grants which the Department have made for some years past to the Organisation Society will cease at the close of the present year. The Irish Agricultural Organisation Society have informed the Department that the number of co-operative societies of all kinds in existence in Ireland on 1st January last was 925; that 28 new societies were formed during the first six months of this year as compared with 20 in the corresponding period of 1907; and that the movement is growing. The Department are not in a position to say what is the actual number of the co-operative societies above referred to at present in effective operation.

Towns Adopting The Notification of Births Act.

Mr. SHERWELL (Huddersfield): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the number and names of the towns that have adopted the Notification of Births Act.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Act has been adopted by the councils of 107 boroughs and urban districts, by 16 Metropolitan borough councils, and by the Common Council of the City of London. A list of these councils is appended—

Town and other Urban District Councils.

Accrington.
Acton.
Ashton-in-Makerfield.
Aston Manor.
Atherton.
Baldock.
Barry.
Bath.
Batley.
Barking Town.
Beckenham.
Birmingham.
Bishop Auckland
Blackburn.
Blackpool.
Bolton.
Bootle.
Bradford (Yorks).
Bromley.
Burnley.
Burslem.
Bushey.
Bury.
Cambridge.
Cardiff.
Chepping Wycombe.
Cheshunt.
Chesterfield.
Chiswick.
Colne.
Crompton.
Croydon.
Darwen.
Derby.
Dewsbury.
Dudley.
Eastbourne.
East Retford.
Edmonton.
Eccles.
Exeter.
Farnworth.
Finchley.
Grantham.
Halifax.
Handsworth (Staffs.)
Higham Ferrers.
Ilkeston.
Keighley.
Kettering.
King's Norton.
Kingston-on-Hull.
Lancaster.
Leek.
Liverpool.
Longton.
Luton.
Macclesfield.
Maidstone.
Mansfield.
Merthyr Tydfil.
Middlesbrough.
Morley.
Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Newport (Mon.)
Norwich.
Nottingham.
Oldham.
Preston.
Portland.
Rawtenstall.
Reading.
Rochdale.
Rotherham.
Royal Leamington Spa.
Ruislip-Northwood
St. Helens (Lancs.)
Sheffield.
Sheerness.
Shipley.
Shrewsbury.
Southampton.
Southport.
Smethwick.
Stockport.
Stockton.
Stalybridge.
Stourbridge.
Stretford.
Swinton and Pendlebury.
Tottenham.
Teignmouth.
Tunstall.
Tyldesley-with-Shakerley.
Wallsend.
Wellingborough.
West Bromwich.
West Ham.
Whitchurch (Salop).
Winchester.
Watford.
Whitehaven.
Willesden.
Wolverhampton.
Woodford.
Worcester.
York.

Metropolitan Borough Councils.

Battersea.
Bermondsey.
Fulham.
Finsbury.
Hampstead.
Holborn.
Islington.
Kensington.
Lambeth.
Marylebone, St.
Pancras, St.
Paddington.
Poplar.
Southwark.
Westminster.
Woolwich.

City of London.

Appointment of Pension Officers.

Mr. BROOKE (Tower Hamlets, Bow, and Bromley): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the appointment of pension officers is to be made solely and entirely out of the ranks of existing Excise officers.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Yes, that is the intention.

Old-Age Pensions and Exemption from Paying Rates.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a person who has been exempted from paying his rates by the local authority will be considered as having been in receipt of Poor Law relief; and whether a person under such circumstances would be disqualified from receiving an old-age pension as provided by the Pension Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) It has been decided that an excusal from payment of the poor rate on the ground of poverty is not a disqualification for registration as Parliamentary elector by reason of amounting to the receipt of relief. The excusal from payment of rates on the ground of poverty would not disqualify the person excused for the receipt of an old-age pension.

Arrest of Mr. J. Magner at Kildorrery.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will inquire into the circumstances attending the arrest by Sergeant Shelley, Royal Irish Constabulary, of Mr. Jeremiah Magner at the fair of Kildorrery, County Cork, on the 29th ultimo, on the charge of interfering with the sale of ponies; whether he is aware that, on being taken to the police barracks, Mr. Magner was at once released, the charge against him being devoid of foundation; and whether Sergeant Shelley will be directed to exercise reasonable care and discretion in future before subjecting a respectable man to the indignity of being arrested and taken through a public thoroughfare upon a groundless accusation.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) On the occasion in question a complaint was made to Sergeant Shelley that a man was kicking ponies which were for sale in the fair. The sergeant went to the spot and saw a man still kicking the animals. On being remonstrated with the man again kicked one of the ponies, whereupon the sergeant demanded his name and address with the object of summoning him for cruelty. The man gave a name which the sergeant believed to be false, and he thereupon took him to the police station where his correct name was ascertained to be Jeremiah Magner. He has since been summoned for cruelty to animals, and the case is pending. Sergeant Shelley's action in the matter was quite regular.

Distribution of the Gore Booth Estate.

MR. F. MEEHAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the tenants on the estate of Sir Joslyn Gore Booth, Ballintullie, County Sligo, purchased their holdings at the rate of twenty-four and-a-half years' purchase; and whether it was on the understanding, at the time of sale, that all waste and untenanted lands on the estate would be divided among the holders of uneconomic holdings, and that the landlord was to keep the river-bed cleaned to prevent the flooding of the lands.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The advances applied for in the purchase agreements signed by the second-term and first-term tenants represented 24·2 and 22·4 years purchase, respectively of the judicial rents. No reference is made in the agreements to the other matters referred to in the Question, but the Estates Commissioners will have these matters inquired into when the estate is being dealt with.

Evicted Tenants—Application of Peter Kelly.

MR. F. MEEHAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application from Peter Kelly, of Mullaghgarriff, Dromahair, an evicted tenant on the West estate, County Leitrim, for reinstatement; and whether the Commission will make inquiries into his claim with a view of having him reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have not received an application from Peter Kelly.

Forestalling of Irish Fairs.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Privy Council have, on the advice of the Law Officers, disallowed a bye-law of the King's County, passed to prevent the destruction of the Banagher great fair by preventing the same being forestalled by street-selling antecedent to the fair; is he aware that the great horse fair of Cahirmee, County Cork, is being similarly destroyed by forestalling, and that the decrees of the Chancery Division are rendered worthless by the refusal of the police to prevent animals being exhibited and sold on the streets in anticipation of the fair; will he inquire whether horse-buyers from all parts of Europe are disappointed and the sellers of animals prejudiced by the uncertainty and irregularity created by this system of forestalling, which makes it impossible for horse-buyers to know where and when a fair begins; and whether, as the King's County Council was the first to attempt a practical remedy for the evil, the Government will either not disallow such byelaws or will order the police to prevent the forestalling of fairs by preventing the public streets and roads being used for days and nights anterior to the advertised fair day, whereby sellers of horses are often defrauded of the true market rates and buyers forced to resort to irregular dealings in anticipation of the true fair.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The proposed bye-law in question prohibited the sale or exposure for sale of cattle and other live stock in any public place in King's County on any day except the duly appointed fair or market day. The proposed bye-law was disallowed by the Privy Council, on the advice of the Law Officers, as being beyond the powers of the county council under the Acts in pursuance of which the bye-law was proposed to be made. The police cannot interfere in the matter unless an obstruction of the thoroughfare takes place, and I am informed that no such obstruction has occurred calling for the interference of the police in the case of either Banagher or Cahirmee. It is open to the owners of the fairs to take legal proceedings for the protection of their interests, but such interests cannot properly be protected by means of bye-laws for good rule and Government.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Blake"—Labourers on Joiners' Work.

MR. W. T. WILSON (Lancashire, Westhoughton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that labourers in the Naval Store in Chatham Dockyard are being employed in making and fitting racks, bins, shelves, etc., for store-rooms on H.M.S. "Blake"; that this is joiners' work and is usually done by joiners, at joiners' rates of pay, under the constructive manager; that, when complaint was made of a similar character as regards work on H.M.S. "Blenheim," the Admiral Superintendent promised to stop any further joiners' work being done by labourers; and whether he will take action to put a stop to this practice.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I am unable to trace any complaint such as the hon. Member speaks of, with regard to H.M.S. "Blenheim." The work of preparing the racks for stowage on board H.M.S. "Blake" was carried out by the storehouse staff, and they were afterwards taken on board in parts and fitted in place by the ship's staff under the supervision of the carpenter of the vessel. I am making further inquiries into the whole matter.

Torpedo Boats in the Hamble River.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it has been decided to moor twenty-five torpedo-boat destroyers in Hamble River; whether any destroyers have been sent up that river for experimental purposes; and how many of those destroyers ran aground.

I beg also to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether it is possible for torpedo-boat destroyers to navigate the Hamble River at a speed of less than eight knots; whether vessels proceeding at that speed create a dangerous swell in such narrow waters; and whether any accidents have been caused thereby to vessels afloat or ashore in the Hamble River.

I beg further to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the proposed mooring of twenty-five torpedo-boat destroyers in Hamble River will so narrow the navigable channel as to render it impossible for any sailing vessel to beat up or down the river, and that in consequence of that fact, and of the dangerous swell caused by torpedo-boat destroyers using the river at high speeds, a large number of yachts and other vessels are leaving the river; and whether, in view of the dissatisfaction and distress thereby created among the waterside population, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

Mr. McKENNA: Destroyers have been sent up the Hamble River on two or three occasions and none ran aground. They can navigate the river at a speed of less than eight knots, but eight knots is preferable; at the latter speed they do not create a dangerous swell and no accidents to vessels afloat or ashore have so far as is known been caused thereby. The destroyers, if moored in the Hamble River, would to a certain extent narrow the channel, but not render it impossible for sailing vessels to beat up or down the river. No destroyers have used the river at high speeds, and there has been no dangerous swell such as suggested. No report has been received that vessels are leaving the Hamble River. The general question of mooring destroyers in the Hamble River is still engaging attention.

Mr. ASHLEY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that an accident was lately caused to a yacht which was on the stocks waiting to be floated off, and which was considerably damaged by the swell caused by one of the passing torpedo boats?

Mr. McKENNA: The accident has not been reported to the Admiralty, but I will inquire.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Has the right hon. Gentleman received a memorial from inhabitants on both banks of the river with regard to the possible disturbance of the trade, and will the right hon. Gentleman bear that point in mind in considering the general question?

Mr. McKENNA: Yes, it will be taken into full consideration.

Mr. ASHLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman favourably consider a claim for compensation from the owner of the yacht I have referred to?

Mr. McKENNA: Without some knowledge of the accident I cannot say.

Mr. GRETTON (Rutland): Will the interests of the lobster fishery also be borne in mind?

Mr. McKENNA: Yes, that will be taken into account.

Sir ROBERT HOBART (Hampshire, New Forest): Is there not ample accommodation in Southampton water outside the Hamble River for all classes of torpedo boats and destroyers without interfering with the navigation of the river?

Mr. McKENNA: None of these facts will be overlooked by the Admiralty.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman compensate the poor fishermen for any damage done to their boats?

Mr. McKENNA: No damage has occurred.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: If any does occur then?

[No Answer was returned.]

Army Statistics.

Captain KINCAID-SMITH (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the numerical strength of the Yeomanry, Volunteer Artillery, and Volunteer Infantry, respectively, on 1st, January, 1907, and 1st January

1908, and the numerical strength of the Territorial Cavalry, Territorial Artillery and Territorial Infantry on 1st July, 1908, stating in each case what is the number of recruits who have joined since 1st January, 1908; and what is the number of Volunteers who have transferred to the Territorial Force.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The figures, which are too many to read out, will be printed with the Votes and Proceedings.

Appended are the figures referred to—

Non-Commissioned Officers and Men.

	Yeomanry and Volunteers including Hon. Artillery Company.		Territorial Force. 1st July, 1908 Provisional Figures.	Recruits 1st January, 1908 to 30th June, 1908, Yeomanry, Volunteers, and Territorial Force (Provisional Figures.)	Transfers from Yeomanry and Volunteers, 1st April, 1908, to 30th June, 1908 Provisional Figures.*
	1st Jan. 1907.	1st Jan. 1908.			
Yeomanry	24,115	24,189	20,622	3,781	19,727
Artillery	38,282	37,314	24,326	6,562	18,609
Infantry	178,128	171,901	111,704	25,636	93,375

* These numbers are not quite complete as some men who have joined new units are not shown as "struck off to the Territorial Force" on the return of their old unit.

Volunteer Long-Service Medal.

MR. MOND (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the Army Order, by which Volunteers of over sixteen years service who have transferred to the Territorial Force will not receive the Volunteer long-service medal, is causing dissatisfaction to many Volunteers who have transferred and is deterring others from transferring; and whether he can see his way to so modify the Order as to permit Volunteers of more than sixteen years service to obtain the Volunteer long service medal, to which they have been looking forward during many years.

MR. HALDANE: As I informed the House yesterday, it has been decided that Volunteers of sixteen years service who have joined the Territorial Force may have the option of being considered either for the long service medal or the new efficiency medal.

The West Riding and the Territorial Army.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what percentage of men required have at present joined the Territorial Army in the West Riding Division.

MR. HALDANE: 9542, have joined out of an establishment of 15,860, *i.e.*, 60 per cent.

Army Remounts.

MR. LANE-FOX: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can yet make any announcement as to the proposals of the Government for meeting the deficiency in remounts for the Army.

MR. HALDANE: I am not yet in a position to add anything to my previous Answers on this question.

Depot Sergeant-Majors.

MR. GIBBS (Bristol, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the fact that depot sergeant-majors are now done away with, and that in consequence extra work devolves upon the sergeant-majors of Special Reserve battalions, he will consider the advisability of placing them on the some footing as regards pay and pension as sergeant-majors in line battalions.

MR. HALDANE: I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the Answer which I gave on 24th March to a similar Question by the hon. and gallant Member for the Ludlow Division of Shropshire. The matter has been fully considered, and it has been decided not to give sergeant-majors of Reserve battalions more than was given to Militia sergeant-majors, as their work will not be so onerous as that of sergeant-majors of Line battalions.

Indian Postal Rates.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India what are the present rates for the inland parcel post in India; and whether, in view of the surplus revenue derived from this source, it is proposed to make any reduction thereon.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): Up to October, 1907, the rate was 2d. for ½ lb., 4d. for 1 lb., 6d. for 2 lbs., and so on up to 2s. for 11 lbs. with special rates for heavier parcels; but the rate for light parcels has now been reduced to 2d. for 1 lb., 4d. for 2 lbs., and so on up to 1s. 10d. for 11 lbs. It is not at present proposed to make a further reduction.

Thefts in the Indian Postal Service.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, in order to improve the service of the Indian Post Office and put an end to the numerous petty thefts constantly taking place therein, it is proposed to increase the rates of pay now given to postal servants and thus induce a better class of workers to enter the service.

MR. BUCHANAN: I am not aware that petty thefts are constantly taking place. The information at my disposal points to the conclusion that the number of offences by postal servants is extremely small, and I have no reason to doubt that they discharge their duties satisfactorily. Increases of pay have recently been granted in many cases, but the ground has, as a rule, been heavier work, greater responsibility, and higher cost of living.

Indian Post Office Registration Fee.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether it is intended to reduce the registration fee from 2d. per article now charged by the Indian Post Office to 1d.

MR. BUCHANAN: The Secretary of State has not received any proposal from the Government of India on the subject.

South African Police.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any Member of the South African Police has been compelled to resign for not being qualified in the Dutch language; whether all Dutchmen in that force must be able to read and write; and what percentage of Dutch are included in the force up to and including 1st July of this year.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel SEELY, Liverpool, Abercromby): I have no information which will enable me to give the hon. and gallant Member the detailed answer he requires, and as regards the first paragraph of the Question I am not aware that any rule has been made. It may be expedient to expect policemen to have some knowledge of the language spoken by the people of the locality.

CAPTAIN FABER: Would the police in different parts of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland be expected to have a knowledge of Gaelic or Celtic as the case may be?

[No Answer was returned.]

Cairo Drainage Schemes.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will make inquiry as to the different schemes of drainage for Cairo which the authorities had under consideration before deciding on the scheme now on foot, and as to whether any, and what, committee of sanitary officers inquired into the matter; and whether he will advise that opportunity be given for a preliminary public discussion of a scheme involving the expenditure of £2,000,000.

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): I am asking the British Representative at Cairo to send a Report on this question, as to the schemes considered and the decision arrived at; but I do not see that a public discussion of rival schemes is the best method of arriving at a sound conclusion on a subject which must in the main be one to be decided by expert advice.

Egyptian Administrators on Leave.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how many, and which, ministers, under-secretaries, and advisers of the Egyptian Government are now absent from Egypt on leave.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I have no information on the subject; the arrangement at any given moment as to the leave of Egyptian officials is not one in which His Majesty's Government could reasonably interfere.

Cairo Newspaper Prosecutions.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what are the exact steps which have been taken to bring to justice the editor of the Cairo newspaper which recently published the false statement that seventy Soudanese, on account of the murder of Mr. Scott-Moncrieff, had been placed in chains and murdered when in prison by the British authorities n the Soudan.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I have not yet received any Report of the exact steps to be taken, but I understand that the editor will be prosecuted before the native tribunal for having contravened the penal code.

Persia.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will publish Papers on the affairs of Persia; and whether he will cause to be included in such Papers a Memorandum of the exchange of views which took place at the recent meeting at Reval and any communications addressed by the Shah of Persia to His Majesty the King in reference to recent events in Teheran. Can the right hon. Gentleman say if it is true that the British Legation was again beset by Persian troops the day before yesterday?

Sir EDWARD GREY: It is not intended to publish Papers if, as I hope, the question of the refugees in the British Legation is satisfactorily settled.

Mr. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the last part of my Question.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I cannot make any further announcement, except that we have protested against the proceedings of the troops concerning the Legation. I hope that the matter will be satisfactorily adjusted, but it is not yet concluded.

Mr. LYNCH (Yorkshire, W.R., Ripon): Are we to understand that no Papers on Persia are to be published before the Foreign Office Vote is debated?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I cannot promise Papers, but when the discussion takes place, I shall be prepared to make a statement with regard to the position of the Government.

Foreign Motor Speed Regulations.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of future legislation with reference to motor traffic, he will obtain and circulate as a Parliamentary Paper Reports from America, France, Germany, Austria, and Italy, shortly summarising the laws as regards speed on town and country roads; and whether in any of the said countries there is any examination of drivers in mechanics or road knowledge.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Full information on this subject will be found in Annex I. to the Report on the Law and Practice as to Motor Cars in the Principal Foreign Countries, issued by the Royal Commission on Motor Cars at the end of 1906, to which I must refer the hon. Member. If more recent information is required, I will endeavour to obtain it.

Cattle Plague in Egypt.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will state the latest Returns as to the recrudescence of cattle plague in Upper and Lower Egypt; and what remedial measures are being taken.

SIR EDWARD GREY: According to the latest Return, cattle disease existed at Alexandria and at twelve other places in the Consular District of Cairo. The question of what remedial measures are being taken is one which concerns the internal administration of Egypt, and I have no information on the subject.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): Has the right hon. Gentleman any returns as to the recrudescence of cattle-driving in Ireland and what remedial measures it is proposed to apply?

[No Answer was returned.]

Turkey and Egypt.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Turkish authorities are fortifying the town of Awga, between Bir Saba and the Egyptian frontier, as a counter-move to the fortification of Kassima and Rafakh by the Egyptian Government last year.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Turks are reported to be building quarters, not fortifications, at Awga. There are police posts at Kassima and Rafakh, but no fortifications.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Are these quarters not fortified?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have given all the information I have and can answer no further Question without notice.

Closing of Egyptian Drinking Establishments.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any compensation was paid to owners in the case of closing 113 establishments for the sale of intoxicating drink belonging to Egyptians, and fifty-four belonging to foreigners in Egypt during the year 1907; and whether any time limit was given.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information on the points raised by the hon. Member; but I will, if he desires it, address an inquiry on the subject to His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General in Egypt.

Egyptian National University.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can inform the House, with regard to the proposed national University for Egypt, what sum of money has been subscribed; whether any Egyptian students have been sent to Europe to qualify as professors, and in what subjects; whether the Egyptian Government is giving any grant of money and exercising any authority; and whether the present schools of law, medicine, agriculture, and engineering, etc., will be included.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I returned on 4th June to a Question asked on the subject by the hon. Member for East Tyrone. I have no later information; as soon as any is forthcoming I shall be glad to make it known.

Income-Tax Appeals.

*SIR H. AUBREY-FLETCHER (Sussex, Lewes): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that it is the practice of many boards of Income-Tax Commissioners, on the hearing of appeals, to require the withdrawal of the appellant after making his statement, and in his absence to hear statements and arguments from the surveyor which are not necessarily either impartial or true; whether this practice is of general adoption or not; whether it has the approval of the Chancellor of the Exchequer or of the Inland Revenue Commissioners or any other controlling authority; and whether there is any intention of abolishing this practice, which is opposed to the invariable policy of British judicial tribunals.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I am aware that it is the practice of many district boards of Tax Commissioners, after eliciting all the facts of the case and hearing all the arguments on any points of law on the part of the Crown and of the appellant to deliberate among themselves before arriving at a decision. Even though it were the practice of any Commissioners to invite, in the appellant's absence, statements and arguments from the surveyor, this does not afford any ground for the reflection contained in the Question upon the fairness or veracity of an honourable body of servants of the Crown.

Tobacco Growing in Ireland.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any allowance or abatement will be made to those people in Ireland who may desire to try the experiment of growing tobacco under the Irish Tobacco Act of last year.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: After consulting my right hon. friend the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture, etc., I have arranged that, instead of the rebate which is allowed at present, a sum of £6,000 shall be placed at the disposal of the Department in the next financial year and subsequently up to 1913 for the encouragement of the tobacco industry in Ireland.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY asked the right hon. Gentleman if he would not mete out the same treatment to Scotland.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) asked if the right hon. Gentleman would likewise take steps to promote the cultivation of tobacco in England also.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND inquired whether it was not the fact that the present position of the tobacco industry in Ireland was the result of six or seven years laborious experiment which showed that Ireland was especially suitable for the cultivation of tobacco.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is so. If similar representations are made to me in regard to Scotland, England, or Wales, I shall be glad to consider them.

Betting Men and Income-Tax.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is the practice for the Commissioners of income-tax to charge income-tax upon the profits of bookmakers and other betting men; and, if so, whether, having regard to the declared policy of His Majesty's Government not to raise any revenue from such sources, he will take the necessary steps, by regulation or otherwise, to exclude such incomes from the purview of the Commissioners in future.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It was decided by the Courts in the case of Partridge *v.* Mallandaine (L.R. 18, Q.B.D., 276) that "a person who attends races and systematically bets" is liable to assessment to income-tax in respect of the profits he derives therefrom; and this decision is acted upon in practice by District Commissioners of Taxes. I do not propose to introduce legislation with the object of withdrawing these profits from assessment to income-tax.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): Has the right hon. Gentleman information which shows that bookmakers and other betting men accurately divulge the extent of their profits?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am not sure whether they would not be the exception.

*Captain FABER : Are there any other betting men who make profits besides bookmakers ?

Insurance Agents and Suicide.

Mr. W. THORNE (West Ham, S): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the number of insurance agents that have committed suicide during the past five years.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Herbert Samuel Yorkshire, Clevland): The Secretary of State has no information on the subject, and regrets that it would be impracticable to attempt to obtain it.

Public Rights on the Upper Thames.

Mr. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley) I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that as the law now stands with regard to the Upper Thames there is no express duty laid upon the Conservators to preserve the river and its banks as a place of public recreation, and that with the decay of the river as a means of commercial traffic many ancient rights of the public have been lost; that within recent years public access to the river from places on its banks has not been maintained; that rights of way along portions of the towpath have been disputed; that public crossings of the river have been closed, and that in every case the Conservators, when appealed to, have stated that they are unable to intervene; that great loss has been caused to the inhabitants of many riverside parishes through excessive floods, and that the Conservators in their recent Reports, while recording their attempts to deal with this evil, state that they are not a flood authority or charged with the duties of carrying out measures of flood relief; that the Conservators hold their meetings in private; that they are not responsible to any Government department and that there is no appeal from their decision; and whether, in view of these facts, the Government will again consider the advisability of themselves introducing legislation to extend the duties of the new Conservancy Board, and, where necessary, to increase their powers, so that the interests of the public in the Upper Thames, and of the population along its banks, may be adequately protected.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Churchill, Dundee): As I have already informed my hon. friend I am taking steps to ensure that the new authority for the Upper Thames shall include representatives of those who use the river, and who will be interested in preserving and extending public rights. I have no doubt that the authority will consider whether they have sufficient powers for the preservation of the amenities of the river and for the prevention of floods. I fully recognise the importance of maintaining the rights of the public, and the interests of the riparian population, but as I have already stated, I am advised that these matters so far as they involve increasing the powers and duties of the Conservators cannot be dealt with in the Bill now before Parliament. Before considering the question of introducing any further legislation on behalf of the Government, it is necessary to await the constitution of the new authority and to give them an opportunity to consider what further powers, if any, they desire to obtain.

Mr. MYER (Lambeth, N.): Will the action of the Government be retrospective ?

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. MORRELL: Is it the intention of the Government to extend the duties of the Conservancy as well as its powers ? And is there any precedent for a new authority applying to Parliament itself to have more extended duties placed on it ?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I should like to have notice of that Question.

Motor Traffic and Highway Maintenances.

Sir F. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware of the increased expenditure in respect of highways which local authorities find necessary to meet the ever-increasing volume of heavy motor traffic ;

whether the Government intend to introduce legislation for the regulation of such traffic, and for some adequate contribution of local authorities in aid of the maintenance of the highway.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): There has been a growth in respect of highway expenditure in recent years, but I cannot say how far this is due to heavy motor car traffic. No promise can be given to introduce legislation with regard to such traffic during the present session. As respects a contribution towards the cost of highway maintenance I would refer to the Answer given on 1st April last by the Prime Minister, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, to a Question put to him by the hon. Member for the Southern Division of Wexford. My right hon. friend then stated that the matter could not properly be dealt with except in connection with the relations between the Exchequer and local taxation generally, a subject which was receiving the consideration of the Government.

Audit of Public Accounts.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether public auditors have been instructed to call for the production of all tenders when auditing the accounts of public bodies, and if it is found that the lowest tender has not been accepted to make a surcharge; if so, will he consider the advisability of withdrawing or modifying such instruction so that fair contract clauses may not be rendered inoperative.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The Local Government Board have not issued any instructions to the district auditors to the effect referred to in the Question.

Motor Traffic in London.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): On behalf of the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland, I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any application has been received by the Local Government Board from any local authority in London to reduce the speed of motor cars in the public streets.

MR. JOHN BURNS: Representations have recently reached me from seven Metropolitan borough councils in favour of a reduced speed-limit for motor vehicles in London. An application to the Local Government Board under Section 9 of the Motor Car Act, 1903, for a reduction of speed-limits must in London be made by the Common Council as regard the City, and by the County Council as regards the rest of London. The only formal application under the section for a reduced speed-limit in London was made by the Common Council in 1904. The proposal was, at the suggestion of the Board, allowed to stand over for twelve months, and it has not been renewed. No application has been made by the County Council.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether any of the seven applications were sent in consequence of the speed of the hon. Member's own motor car for which he was fined?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I cannot say; and it would not have influenced me in the least.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the speed of motor omnibuses in some of the poorer and more crowded parts of London is a source of very great terror to the people, and especially to the children? Can he promise to bring in some legislation to allay that terror?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am aware of the matter, and am glad to think that the Home Secretary and myself have done our best to render the condition of the London streets more safe than they were. I am happy to be able to say that a considerable improvement has taken place. While it is reported that in the first quarter of 1907 proceedings were taken against 418 motor vehicles, in the first quarter of the present year the number of prosecutions and convictions was 1,133.

Erith Unemployed Grants.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the President of the Local

Government Board whether he is aware that the Erith Urban Council, which received sanction from his Department to raise a loan of £3,000 in order that work might be found for the unemployed in the widening of the Lower Abbey Road, has stopped the work, although the local distress committee has a balance in hand of £600 remaining from the grant of £1,252 received from the Local Government Board; and whether, in view of the distress prevailing in the district through lack of employment, he proposes to take any, and what, action in the matter.

MR. JOHN BURNS: My attention has already been drawn to the circumstances of the case referred to in the Question, and I am in communication with the distress committee and the urban district council on the subject.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford) asked as to the exact legal position of the urban council in suspending the works.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have been in communication with the local authority. So far as I am concerned, my power is very limited, but I sincerely trust the local authority will get out of the difficulty as soon as possible.

MR. ROWLANDS: But is there no power to insist on their spending the balance of the grant?

MR. JOHN BURNS: The grant to the distress committee was conditional on the authority adding to it. That authority without consulting the Local Government Board have suspended the work. If I can see my way out of the difficulty to secure that the money is spent I shall adopt the course.

Post Office Savings Bank.

MR. GIBBS (Bristol, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state the average sum per annum deposited in the Post Office Savings Bank per head of depositors for the last five years, and also the number of depositors each year for the last five years.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The number of accounts open at the end of each year is given in Appendix J. to the Postmaster-General's Report. It is not possible, without great labour and expense, to say in how many of these accounts deposits were actually made in each year. The average sum deposited per open account was as follows in each of the last five years—

	£	s.	d.
1903 - - - -	4	6	10
1904 - - - -	4	3	11
1905 - - - -	4	4	10
1906 - - - -	4	5	1
1907 - - - -	4	2	8

Half-Timers.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can state the terms of reference for the proposed Committee of inquiry respecting the question of half-timers, and announce the object of the Committee and the extent to which organisations of workers would be represented thereon; whether he is aware of the increase of voluntary effort designed to give children of the poorer classes a few days' summer rest in the country or at the seaside; and whether he can consider the necessity of extending Government help to private effort, and make it more adequate for the children's needs.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): I hope to be in a position to announce the terms of reference and the *personnel* of the Committee in the course of a few days. At present I can only say that representatives of the operatives will be included. With regard to the last part of the Question, I am aware that efforts in the direction indicated are being made by individuals and societies; but while sympathising entirely with such enterprises I regret I can hold out no hope of financial assistance from the Government, in view of the numerous calls upon the Exchequer. I may say, however, that experiments are being made by certain local authorities, with the approval and under the supervision of the Board, in the direction of establishing open-air schools.

MR. CLYNES: Is it intended to place on the Committee a representative of the Half-Timers' Council?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am now considering the constitution of the Committee and if the hon. Member has any representations to make to me I will consider them.

AN HON. MEMBER: And will he also consider the desirability of having schools erected on sites in healthy districts?

MR. RUNCIMAN: That hardly arises out of the question but it is a very good thing to aim at.

Small Holdings and Market Gardeners' Compensation Act.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether a county council in letting land for small holdings under the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, 1907, can introduce a proviso that the Market Gardeners' Compensation Act shall not apply.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir E. STRACHEY, Somerset, S.): Yes, but there is an appeal to the Board of Agriculture.

Fruit Trees for Small Holdings.

MR. CLOUGH: I beg to ask the hon Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether a county council can, under the provisions of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, 1907, supply fruit trees as part of the equipment for small holdings.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: No, Sir.

Small Holdings Act.

MR. CLOUGH: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906, will apply to any small holdings provided by a county council under the operation of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, 1907.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Yes, Sir.

Dividing Societies.

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what are the reasons that have caused the Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies to insist on a valuation in the case of dividing societies, thus reversing what has been the practice in the past.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The noble Lord is mistaken in thinking that valuation in the case of dividing societies is insisted upon. He no doubt has in mind the fee of £2 covering a quinquennial period amounting to 8s. per annum, which is now charged to these societies for exemption from quinquennial valuation and which is intended to cover the time and trouble involved in examining the claims of societies to such exemption.

VISCOUNT MORPETH: Is it not the case that in the past dividing societies have been exempted from valuation merely on application, and that the fee of £2 now imposed is found by them to be very onerous and a source of great difficulty in applying for exemption?

MR. HOBHOUSE: I do not think so. The sum of 8s. cannot be considered a very onerous charge.

VISCOUNT MORPETH: Has it not been represented to the hon. Gentleman by persons who are interested that it is in fact a very heavy burden upon them?

MR. HOBHOUSE: No, Sir. The only information I have was contained in a letter written to the Treasury a year ago.

Irish Law Court Funds.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can say what proportion of the funds under the control of the different Irish Courts have been invested by the authorities of the Courts; whether the accruing dividends on investments are re-invested or are allowed to accumulate; and what proportion is allowed to accumulate.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange): I am informed that it is not practicable to differentiate between the funds in the hands of the Accountant-General which were already invested at at the time of their transfer into Court, and those which were invested under Orders of the Court subsequent to their transfer into Court. Unless otherwise directed, cash lodgments of £50 and upwards in the Chancery Division are, after the expiration of six months from the date of lodgment, invested in New Consols without order or request. Dividends are re-invested as follows: (1) In the case of funds lodged under any of the Trustee Acts, when the amount of the dividends available reaches the sum of £10; (2) in cases in which there is an order to invest, when the amount of such dividends reaches £20; and (3) in all other cases when the amount reaches £50.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can state the total value of cash and securities held, or banked by, or in the names of the Chancery and Common Law Divisions, land judges, and suitors' cash; how much of this total represents capital and how much represents dividends; how much of this total has been dormant for fifteen years or more; and whether the dormant total is regarded as the unclaimed total.

Mr. CHERRY: The totals of the liabilities and of the assets in respect of the cash and securities constituting the funds of suitors in the Supreme Court in Ireland, as they stood on 30th September last, are set out in the account of the Accountant-General of the Supreme Court which has been published in a Return to an Order of the House of Commons, dated 30th January last. (Parliamentary Paper No. 22 of the present session). It would be impossible in most cases to state how much of these funds represents dividends and how much principal, as the dividends become merged in the principal, on investment, and when each subsequent sale or transfer of any portion of the fund has taken place such sale or transfer has been made out of the accumulated fund as it stood at the time being. The amount of the funds standing to the credit of the dormant accounts on 30th September last, as undealt with during the previous fifteen years, was: Cash, £174,694 11s. 9d.; New Consols, £204,790 17s. 11d. Other than these there are no unclaimed totals; and in respect of these totals claims for principal and interest are being frequently made and sustained, and when sustained such portion of the funds as may be required to meet each claim is paid out.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he can say if the Court of Chancery in Ireland holds any boxes of plate or valuables; and, if so, how many, and how long they have been in the possession of the Court.

Mr. CHERRY: I am informed that there are thirty-eight boxes of plate or other valuables which have been lodged in Court, and stand to the credit of the accounts to which they belong. They have been for the most part lodged in minor and lunacy cases, and the accounts to which they stand are current and according to the circumstances of each case will be dealt with, together with the funds to the same credit, when the proper time arrives.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: Can the right hon. Gentleman say if some of these boxes were lodged as far back as the time of James II.?

Mr. CHERRY: If so, the accounts would, I should think, be dormant by this time.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: Are they not all unclaimed?

Mr. CHERRY: No, the owners are known.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: But they have not claimed?

Mr. CHERRY: I gather not.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: And they have been there over 100 years.

Irish Congested Districts Board.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now make a full statement as to what has been done by the Congested Districts Board in the matter of stopping works; whether their action has been due to want of funds; and what steps the Government propose to take in the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): In the year ending 31st March last the Congested Districts Board expended about £97,000 upon the improvement of estates purchased by them. I indicated, in my reply to the hon. Member's Question of 4th March last, that, owing to want of funds the operations of the Board in this direction would necessarily have to be restricted in the present financial year, the main reason for the lack of funds being that the Board's income from the resale of estates had fallen considerably short of their anticipations. For the current year the Congested Districts Board could provide for improvement works the sum of £33,000 only, and this after borrowing from the Board of Works to the full extent of their powers. Of this £33,000, the sum of £18,000 has been expended up to 30th June, and the remaining £15,000 will not, in the ordinary course, be available for some months. The Board have been gradually reducing the number of men employed on improvement works, and in the last two or three weeks upwards of 1,000 men have been disemployed, leaving about 150 men still at work. I fully recognise that the complete suspension of the Board's improvement works, from whatever cause it may have arisen, is undesirable, and I have been in communication with the Treasury on the subject, and the Treasury have agreed to make a loan to the Board within reasonable limits, in order that the Board may proceed with the works until they are again in funds. I am in communication with the Board as to the works which it is possible and desirable to carry on, and the amount of the loan which will be required for the purpose. It will, as I indicated on 4th March, be impossible to introduce legislation providing for an increase of the Board's statutory income apart from the legislation which must be adopted as a result of the Report of the Royal Commission on Congestion. The question of the legislation on that subject to be introduced in the coming autumn is at present engaging the consideration of the Government.

MR. DILLON: Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind that this is a singularly favourable season for carrying on these works in Ireland—a season such as only occurs at intervals of two or three years?

MR. BIRRELL: Yes, I will point that out in my report to the Treasury.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Will any of the money go to Ulster?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not know what the state of congestion is there.

Canada and Irish Trade.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any, and, if so, what steps will be taken to carry out the recommendations of the special trade commissioner to Canada and Newfoundland, and, in the event of a permanent appointment being made, will he secure that the officer is fully acquainted with Irish trade conditions, with a view to having the interests of Irish exporters properly attended to in these two countries; and whether, in particular, the co-operation of the Irish Industrial Development Associations and of the Department of Agriculture will be sought.

MR. CHURCHILL: In reply to the hon. Member's Question, I may inform him that Mr. Richard Grigg has been appointed as His Majesty's Trade Commissioner in Canada. Mr. Grigg, as the hon. Member is aware, recently completed a commercial mission in Canada and Newfoundland for the Advisory Committee to the Board of Trade on Commercial Intelligence. I have also appointed the following Gentlemen as local trade correspondents in Canada: Mr. W. J. Davidson, Vancouver; Mr. J. J. Shallcross, Victoria; Mr. J. Appleton, Winnipeg; Mr. W. E. Anderson, St. John, New Brunswick; Mr. G. B. Ramsey, Quebec; Mr. A. T. Weldon Halifax, Nova Scotia. It is possible that I shall make some further appointments of local correspondents in Canada. The local trade correspondent in Newfoundland is Mr. H. W. le Messurier. I shall be happy to consider any suggestions which the Department of Agriculture or the Irish Development Association may make with the object of rendering the services of the Trade Commissioner as useful as possible to Irish trade.

Irish Butter in Scotland.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that Section 1, subsection (3), of the Butter and Margarine Act, 1907, is not being carried into effect in Scotland; whether steps are being taken by the Local Government Board to carry out Section 2, subsection (1), of the same Act; and what action, if any, is being taken by the local authorities in Scotland to put subsection (2) of Section 1, in regard to powers of inspection, entry and sampling, into force.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: To the first part of the hon. Member's Question the Answer is "Yes," and steps have and are being taken to give effect to the Act in Scotland. To the second, the Board of Agriculture are carrying out the subsection. To the third, the Board is inquiring what action is being taken.

Irish Land Purchase Sinking Fund.

Mr. KAVANAGH (Carlow): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the present amount of the Sinking Fund of the Irish Land Purchase Act, 1903.

Mr. HOBHOUSE: The total accumulated Sinking Fund under the Irish Land Act, 1903, amounted on 31st May, 1908 (the latest date for which the figures are available), to £221,337, viz.—

	£
In respect of advances - -	155,835
In respect of Excess Stock -	32,385
In respect of Land Purchase Aid Fund - - -	33,117

The Sinking Fund receipts in respect of the June Gale will increase the above total figure by £53,500, of which £46,000 will be for Advances, and £7,500 for Excess Stock.

Licensing Leases and the Licensing Bill.

*Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to an example of a long lease of on-licensed premises granted by an educational institution with the sanction of the Board of Charity Commissioners; whether he is aware that under this lease, granted in 1897 for ninety-nine years, the lessee will remain liable for the remainder of the term of the lease to pay a rental of £600 a year, agreed to because the premises possessed a licence, although the licence will, under the provisions of the Licensing Bill, be terminated at the end of fourteen years; whether, if a re-grant of the licence be obtained at the end of the time-limit, monopoly value will have to be paid for the licence, despite that the lessee is already paying the full rental value of the premises as licensed premises under the lease; and, if so, whether he proposes to make any provision in the Licensing Bill to meet cases of this kind.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.): My attention has been drawn to the lease in question. No doubt at the end of the time-limit monopoly value will have to be paid for the re-grant of the licence of the licensed premises which are included with certain other trade premises in the lease; but I am by no means satisfied that any special hardship will actually arise. A person who ten years ago took a lease which included licensed premises for a long term, such as ninety-nine years, obviously ought to have taken, and, in all probability did take, into consideration the possibility of changes being made during that time by further legislation in the conditions affecting the renewal of the licence.

*Mr. YOUNGER: Would not the existing holder at the end of the time limit be in a more difficult position than any outsider who wanted a grant? Would he not be handicapped?

Mr. ASQUITH: I do not think that follows; nor is it the intention of the Government. It is a particular bargain in each particular case.

*Mr. YOUNGER: But if the bargain is made and cannot be undone?

Mr. ASQUITH: If a man has made an improvident bargain, I do not think it is the business of the State to remedy that.

Autumn Recess.

Mr. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is in a position to say on what date in the autumn this House will resume business after the summer recess.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, for the convenience of those Members of this House whose homes are at a distance, he can state on what day he proposes the House should rise for the autumn recess and on what day it should meet for the winter session.

Mr. ASQUITH: I hope to make a statement on Friday.

Tobacco Growing in England and Wales.

Mr. C. B. HARMSWORTH: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is in a position to promise for next year legislation permitting the cultivation of tobacco in England and Wales.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am not in a position to make any statement on this matter.

The Wholesale Wine Trade.

Sir ROBERT HOBART: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the disturbing effect upon the wholesale wine trade of Clause 21 of the Licensing Bill, he can see his way to distinguish between the wholesale and retail sale, which are now equally authorised by a wine-dealer's licence, so that the holder of a wine-dealer's licence, who would exclude himself and could be excluded from retail sale, could be excluded from the operation of Clause 21.

Mr. ASQUITH: I have given very careful consideration to my hon. friend's suggestion, but its adoption would necessitate a complete revision of the present wine-dealers' and wine retailers' licences, and this would be outside the scope of the Licensing Bill now before Parliament. As it is the clear intention of the clause to confine the Justices' control to sale by retail, it is not, in my opinion, to be anticipated that they would decline to give a certificate in any case in which it is established that the trade to be carried on is to be of an exclusively wholesale character.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. KEIR HARDIE asked on what day the Indian Budget would be taken.

Mr. ASQUITH: I think probably on the 22nd, but I cannot say definitely.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked what was the business for Friday.

Mr. ASQUITH: I have already stated that we propose to take on Friday the usual annual Motion for suspension of the Eleven o'clock rule for the remainder of this part of the session. This will afford me an opportunity of making a more general statement as to the further course of business. After that is over, we intend, if necessary—but I hope some agreement may be arrived at in the interval which will make it unnecessary—to propose a Procedure Resolution for dealing with the remaining stages of the Irish Universities Bill.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Should that happy augury prove to be well founded, what will be the second Order?

Mr. ASQUITH: Some of the smaller Bills. I will tell the right hon. Gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: When is it proposed to take the Finance Bill?

Mr. ASQUITH: I would rather not say at present when the remaining stages of the Finance Bill will be taken. I will answer on Thursday or the beginning of next week.

SELECTION.

Ordered, That Mr. Munro Ferguson be discharged from the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That Mr. Pirie be added to the Committee.—(*Sir William Brampton Gurdon.*)

COMMONS (REGULATION OF TOWYN TREWAN COMMON, ANGLESEY).

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence relative thereto, brought up, and read.

Special Report brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 217.]

NEW BILLS.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (ADVERTISING) BILL.

"To enable Local Authorities to advertise the attractions and advantages of their districts," presented by Sir Thomas Roe; supported by Mr. Godfrey Baring, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. William Lever, Mr. Nield, Sir Herbert Roberts, Mr. Luke White, Mr. Harmood-Banner, and Mr. Alfred Scott; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 22nd July, and to be printed. [Bill 304.]

PUBLIC HEALTH (SEWERS AND DRAINS) (No. 2) BILL.

"To amend the Public Health Acts with respect to the combined drainage of two or more houses belonging to the same owner," presented by Mr. Vivian; supported by Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Walters, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Bowles, Sir William Collins, Mr. Waterlow, Sir William Bull, and Viscount Morpeth; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 305.]

NATIONAL MILITARY TRAINING (No. 2) BILL.

*CAPTAIN **KINCAID-SMITH** (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon) moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, 1907, and to establish national military training in the Territorial Force. He said the measure was a sequel to the very valuable framework and structure created by the Secretary of State for War in his great Territorial Army organisation scheme, a scheme for which the right hon. Gentleman had not, in his opinion, received sufficient credit, although it would always remain connected with his name in the same way as the name of Mr. Cardwell was associated with the linked battalion system. In fact he believed that the scheme of the Secretary of State for War would survive and be a monument of his administration. The right hon. Gentleman was not to blame for failure to secure the full complement of men, nor must he be blamed if the units composing the Territorial Army were not really effective units. No one could make bricks with straw and no one could make the units of this Army real effective combatant units with the material at present available. The right hon. Gentleman had laid the foundation and built the framework of a great scheme. It was now for the country, by consenting to the system outlined in this Bill, to make the Territorial Army a really effective military machine, instead of a dangerous sham. He had tried to follow the many newspaper criticisms on this scheme. They all tended in one direction—the question asked was, would sufficient men be forthcoming? Never by any chance was the criticism directed to the point whether the units would be effective and competent. He had also asked many hon. Members of the House whether they supported the Bill. Some of them complained that it was an inappropriate and inopportune time for bringing it in, as they wished to give the scheme a chance and see what happened. He desired to be perfectly logical and consistent. They had a framework for the Territorial Army; let the country make it a really effective military machine, let them see that the units were effective and competent. That was the object of the Bill which he was asking leave to introduce. The first three clauses laid it down that any British subject domiciled in Great Britain—the Bill did not include Ireland—[Cries of "Why not?"]—should be liable at the age of eighteen to not more than forty-eight days military training, at the age of nineteen to not more than thirty days, and between the ages of twenty and thirty to not more than fourteen days every alternate year. They would not necessarily be called out for that period. The fifth clause laid it down that the period of training should be carried out in such manner as might be prescribed by Orders in Council; the sixth clause dealt with the preparation of the lists of persons liable to serve, and directed the County Associations to carry out the rules made by Order in Council. It also enabled any person to appeal against being included in the list. Clause 7 described who were to be exempted, the exemptions including persons who had served in the Army or Navy for a period of five years, those who had served in the police for ten years, those who followed the sea as a profession, sons of widows, persons who were habitual drunkards, criminals, or otherwise undesirable, Members of both Houses of Parliament, and persons medically unfit. Persons who were exempt, who also included aliens, would be required to pay a tax of one per cent. on all incomes over £40 a year. Clause 8 described others who might be exempted, such as schoolmasters and ministers of all denominations, members of the judicial bodies, doctors and attendants in hospitals, officers and non-coms. of the Army, Navy and Reserve forces, and prison officials. Clause 9 provided that persons unfit at eighteen years of age, but subsequently found to be fit, should be liable to serve. Clause 11 prescribed the penalties for failing to appear at the training. Clause 12 gave certain privileges to those who had served the full recruit stage and who could pass certain physical and educational tests. Clause 13 enabled those who had passed through the recruit stage to form a special Army reserve with the obligation to serve over seas in case of war; Clause 14 gave power to do a continuous training for one year and thus be acquitted of further liability, except in case of war, and Clause 16 provided for handing over the necessary funds to the County Associations in order to carry out the objects of the Bill. The period of training was not one which was necessarily approved of by the military authorities as likely to make a man an efficient soldier. They held that an essential condition was that the period should not be such as necessarily to interfere with a man's civil occupation; it should not be of such a length as to create a necessity for engaging other men to do the work of the young man while absent for his recruit's training. Employers after six weeks absence of a man would contemplate the necessity of engaging somebody else to do the work of the youth absent on training, and he did not think that either the youth or his parents should be subjected to the haunting fear of losing the civil employment. Again, it was not proposed that youths of eighteen should be called out simultaneously with those of nineteen years of age. He thought people were apt to pay too much attention to the question of the period of training and not enough to the question of the knowledge and efficiency of the permanent training staff. This Bill was brought forward in the belief that it would secure the training of those who would not join the auxiliary forces, and that it would also do something to solve the difficult question of the supply of officers.

*MR. SPEAKER, interposing, reminded the hon. and gallant Member that he had exceeded the usual allotted span.

*CAPTAIN KINCAID-SMITH, with an apology, concluded with an appeal to the House to give a First Reading to the Bill, which he believed embodied the only safe principle to follow for home defence. They must abandon a system which penalised the courageous and patriotic, and which put on the shoulders of the few a duty which should be borne by every citizen of the State.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Territorial and Reserve Forces Act, 1907, and to establish National Military Training in the Territorial Force."—(*Captain Kincaid-Smith.*)

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said the hon. and gallant Member had proposed a scheme for compulsory training for all men between the ages of eighteen and thirty, but he had not told them how many it would affect nor what would be the probable cost. Probably 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 men would come under the operation of the Bill, though that number might possibly be reduced, for the hon. Gentleman had led them to infer that it could be possible to evade this training by becoming either a Member of Parliament or an habitual drunkard. The school to which the hon. and gallant Gentleman belonged was anxious not long ago for compulsory service on the Swiss model, and the cost of that scheme worked out at £19,500,000 annually for an enormous force of 4,000,000. What use had we for such a force ?

MR. MULDOON (Wicklow, E.): Turn them on to the suffragettes.

*MR. HAROLD COX said he did not think the suffragettes would want much compulsion in regard to military training. But he could not conceive circumstances in which a force of 6,000,000 or even of 4,000,000 men would be required for home defence. An invasion of these islands in force would only be possible if our Navy were driven from the sea. Was the House going to contemplate the possibility of our Navy being virtually destroyed ? They would be traitors to their country if they spent a single penny on the military forces if they thought that there was the least danger of the Navy being destroyed. Their first duty was to see that the Navy was strong enough to repel any possible invasion by force. The only other contingency to be considered was the possibility of a raiding force escaping the observation of the Navy. Again, suppose this country was invaded. Would they seriously contemplate meeting such a raid with the Territorial Force ? The raiding force would, of course, be the pick of the enemy's troops, and we should have to send the pick of our Regular soldiers against them, not partially trained conscripts. The same consideration applied to the Territorial Army. The scheme of the Secretary of State for War might serve as a useful means for recruiting the Regular forces; but it was on the Regulars that we must rely for repelling any raids that might escape the vigilance of the Fleet. He imagined that this was also the view of the Secretary of State for War, for the right hon. Gentleman had complained that his Territorial Army was being discouraged by incessant Questions. His right hon. friend could not seriously propose to commit the defence of this country to a force which could be discouraged out of existence by the Questions of hon. Members opposite.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 34; Noes, 250. (Div. List, No. 173.)

AYES.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Fell, Arthur
Gardner, Ernest
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lynch, H. B.
M'Arthur, Charles
M'Iver, Sir Lewis
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Morpeth, Viscount
Percy, Earl
Rees, J. D.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walrond, Hon. Lionel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Captain Kincaid-Smith and Mr. Beaumont.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire

Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C. H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M.Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar,Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dewar,Sir J.A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dilke,Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gill, A. H.
Glen-Coats,Sir T.(Renfrew, W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody(Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gurdon,Rt.Hn.SirWBrampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,RtHn..L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Hemmerde, Edward George

Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
MacNeill,John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Francis E.(Leitrim, N.)
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Murray, James (Aberdeen,E.)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Brien, William (Cork)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare

Pirie, Duncan V.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E.(Edinb'gh,Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea,Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond,John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir JohnH.(Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth,Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley,Hn. A.(Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor,John W. (Durham)
Taylor,Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. de R. (Leicester)
Ward,John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Waring, Walter
Wason,Rt.HnE.(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J.D.(Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond(Merioneth)

Williamson, A.	Winfrey, R.	TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Harold Cox and Mr. Maddison.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)	Wood, T. M'Kinnon	
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)	Yoxall, James Henry	

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

As amended (in Committee and on re-committal), considered.

New clause—

"The trade or business of pension agent who offers to obtain or to try and obtain pensions for other persons for payment or reward shall be illegal, and such agents shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine of not exceeding £50, or to imprisonment for not exceeding six months."—(*Mr. Fell.*)

Brought up, and read a first time.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) in moving the Second Reading of the clause said the Bill contained no provision whatever in regard to pension agents. It had been found in practice in other countries that an undesirable class of persons had sprung up who followed a kind of profession or business as pension agents. They offered their services in helping people to obtain pensions in consideration of receiving reward or payment of some kind, or a share of the pensions obtained, or it might be the first year's pension. He did not wish to suggest that Clause 6 (old-age pensions to be inalienable) would not provide a certain amount of remedy against cases of that kind. But the provisions of that clause would not prevent the friends of people who might be likely to get pensions from offering to an agent £5, or some other sum, to get a pension for this or that person. He would suppose a case which would happen very frequently. In the case of an old woman, not strong-minded, an agent might go to her and ask her age. She might say, perfectly honestly, that she did not know her age. In reply to further questions by the agent the old woman might state that she was nearly seventy, and that she was born say, in London. The agent would then proceed to obtain a certificate of the woman's birth at Somerset House. He would produce it to the old woman as a certificate of her birth, and upon that he would take steps for obtaining a pension for her. He believed that that was the kind of case which arose in other countries where pensions were given. It was notorious that in the United States the business of pension agents had assumed large dimensions. It was really a scandal there, and in numerous cases the agents were paid the first year's pension for their services in obtaning the pension. That was a class of business which he was sure the Treasury would not wish to encourage in this country, but if it was once established, it would be very difficult indeed to stop it. Unless they passed some such clause as that which he proposed, it would not be possible for the Treasury to make regulations to prevent the evil which was certain to grow up.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs) seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was not so apprehensive of the danger referred to as the hon. Member seemed to be. The conditions in America were different. There an applicant had to put in some form of declaration that he was a veteran who had passed through the Civil War. It was a difficult and a complicated business which required a good deal of ingenuity, and he could quite understand that a business had grown up. But he did not think the business of pension agent had been set up in Germany, Denmark, the Colonies, or in any other country where there were old-age pension schemes. If the hon. Member had been able to quote cases from these countries, they would have been much more germane to the particular clause which he had proposed. If these pension agents were established in this country with a view, not of helping the population, but rather of circumventing the law, he thought it would be the duty of the Government to consider at an early stage whether something like what the hon. Member proposed should not be done, but he did not think that they should anticipate results such as those which had occurred in America. He thought the new clause they were now considering would affect people who were perfectly innocent. It would prevent applicants from getting the assistance of members of friendly societies with which they were connected. If they accepted this clause there was just a little danger of that kind of help being withheld. With all submission he did not think it would be wise to introduce such a clause into the Bill. There would be the very severe punishment for a crime which he did not think the hon. Member would find would really be committed in this country. And he did not think it was well to invent a new crime. For that and other reasons he thought that on the whole it was not desirable to accept the Amendment.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.) said he opposed the principle of this Amendment altogether. To accept it would be going back to ancient times. There were laws on the Statute-book which were obsolete, and much mischief might be done by their being brought into operation. He would point out. as an analogy, that Parliament passed a Workmen's Compensation Act in 1906 which was a continuation of the Act of 1897. They might as well not have passed that law so far as several hundred thousands of workmen were concerned, because they had not the assistance of trade unions or friendly societies to give them an opportunity of using the laws which Parliament had put on the Statute-book, and which had, therefore, become utterly inoperative to those who had not a society behind them. There had grown up a number of legal-aid societies, legitimately established for the purpose of assisting the vast number of men who were not members of trade unions or other friendly societies. What mischief had been done by those legal-aid societies? None. The societies were paid by results; the County Court Judges knew of their existence and saw no harm in them. If a poor widow, so graphically pictured by the hon. Member, did get a pension by the aid of a pension agent, what harm would be done? She would not get the pension if she had not some right to it, and if she was aided in getting the pension by a pension agent that pension agent was doing good work both for her and the country, for she would not have been able to establish her title to the pension by her own unaided resources. The Amendment would revert to an obsolete principle, and he opposed its incorporation into the Bill.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) said that the clause which the hon. Member for Great Yarmouth proposed would in no way prevent a trade union or friendly society from rendering legal assistance in establishing a claim to a pension. The clause was only directed against offers to obtain a pension for reward or pecuniary recompense. The hon. Member for Kildare had drawn attention to the fact that under the Workmen's Compensation Acts a large number of people came forward to urge the claims of workmen who had been injured which they thought ought to come under those Acts. He had had some experience of the working of those Acts and he believed the Chancellor of the Exchequer would agree with him when he said that there were a certain number of solicitors who made it a business to go to men who were injured and prevent them accepting legitimate compensation from their employers because they said that if they took the case up and went into Court they would get higher compensation. The result was that these injured men frequently lost what they might have gained but for the intervention of the solicitor, while in other cases men got compensation to which they were not entitled. There were solicitors who induced people to make exaggerated claims under the Acts, and those who suffered were the great employers. In the case of pensions, however, it would be the Treasury and hence the taxpayers who would suffer, because there would be more chance of sympathy being shown to a person who was anxious to obtain a pension illegally. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had given a most extraordinary reason for opposing the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman had said that in other countries, and he instanced Germany, there were no such regulation as that proposed in the Amendment. But in Germany there was a contributory pension system, and the man had a right to his pension. Here they had no right to a pension, and it was, therefore, necessary that something of the sort embodied in the Amendment should be passed. The

Chancellor of the Exchequer had alluded to the case of America where people obtained pensions to which they had no right. There was not the slightest doub that the same thing would occur here unless they had a clause ot this sort in the Bill. As the hon. Member for Preston had said, under this Bill the biggest liar would get the biggest pension; and it was to prevent that that his hon. friend had brought forward this clause. He was inclined to think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on further consideration, would withdraw his objection to the clause. The right hon. Gentleman had not brought forward a single fact to show that the clause would not be operative. Indeed, he had admitted that in his opinion it might be necessary to introduce such a clause, but that it would not be desirable to do so now. because it might give what he called a statutory hint to people to start this business. That would not be necessary, because in these bad times when it was very difficult to get a livelihood of any description at all, there would be any number of people on the look out foı such business. Besides, the hint would already have been given through the Press describing the clause moved by his hon. friend. He believed that in the interests of economy it would be necessary to have some clause in the Bill to this effect; and at any rate it could not do any harm to anybody. It had been said that it would prevent any friendly society or any person actuated by benevolent motives or any person having an interest in the claim for a pension acting legitimately for reward; but all that his hon. friend wanted was to prevent a business being set up by persons who would enter into a stipulation with a claimant that he could get him a pension of £13 if he would give him so much a year out of it for doing so. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that in America a claimant for a pension had to prove that he was descended from one who had been in the war; but here the case was that the claimant had to prove his or her age. In Ireland there was no compulsory registration until 1860, so that there was at once an immense opportunity for fraud. Then a man had to prove that he had worked according to his opportunities and needs. There was nothing to prevent a man coming forward and saying that he would prove it if the claimant shared with him his old-age pension. Of course, that man could not legally recover the money promised by the recipient of the pension, but there might be any number of occasions whereby an extremely clever man might throw dust in the eyes of the Imperial officer who was to be the sole arbitrator in the case for the President of the Local Government Board. For it must be remembered that the President of the Local Government Board had a large amount of business to transact, his mind was occupied in other directions, and, therefore, he could not give the necessary attention to circumvent applications of that sort. He earnestly hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give a little more consideration to this clause and allow it at any rate to have a Second Reading so that, if necessary, they might amend the clause in Committee and make it palatable to the ight hon. Gentleman.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would reconsider his decision. This was a practical difficulty that had to be met, not an imaginary one. The right hon. Gentleman did not speak very definitely when rejecting the clause; he put his reasons upon grounds that could not be influenced by the phraseology. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that the clause would interfere with the operations of friendly societies, who would be unable to get pensions for their clients. But the case met by the new clause was where a fee or reward was given for the express services rendered. That would not be the case with friendly societies, who would offer to do the work for their members gratuitously. Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the penalties sought to be imposed were very heavy, but he might point out that the fine was not to exceed £50 and that the imprisonment was not to be for more than six months. That left it open to impose a small fine or imprisonment for a short time. The reasons given by the

Chancellor of the Exchequer for rejecting the clause were not conclusive. He did not know what information had reached the right hon. Gentleman; but he had heard of many cases where people were going about to friends in their locality urging that they should engage those who had better education and better means of interpreting Acts of Parliament to help them in getting over the difficulties in obtaining a pension. The hon. Member for Kildare had opposed the Amendment on grounds quite different from those put forward by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He apparently wanted people to take up these questions and get the pension for people who would not otherwise get it because of the difficulties of stating their case. But they would take up bad cases in order to obtain a fee or reward. These pensions were to be the solatium of the aged deserving poor, and it was not intended that the fees for obtaining the pension should be paid out of the pension grant. There was no need for any such business under the German system. There it was only necessary for the applicants to prove that they had lived a certain time under certain conditions; the pension being a contributory one they simply produced the papers on which were records of their lives. The moment an Act of Parliament like this, which required a great deal of interpretation, was passed, an Act which exposed many applicants to a great deal of difficulty in making their application good, they were bound to have a certain class of persons rising into existence who would say to them: "If you will entrust your case to me, for a certain sum I will get you a pension which you would not otherwise obtain." That was not the purpose for which the pensions were to be granted. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had admitted that that state of things might arise, but said let them wait until it did arise and then deal with it. That seemed to him rather like waiting until the steed was stolen before locking the stable. They believed rather that prevention was better than cure and that if this evil was likely to grow up provision should be made against it.

*MR. ELLIS DAVIES (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) quite agreed that difficulties might arise if gentlemen were allowed to make exorbitant charges for the services they rendered to persons applying for pensions. But there was the other side of the question to be looked at; applicants might meet with great difficulty in making their applications. There was the difficulty of tracing the place and entry of birth and the greater difficulty of identifying a person over sixty-five years of age. In the practice of his profession he had often found the greatest difficulty in proving that the person referred to in a certificate of birth was the person who was making a claim. Under those circumstances it was often necessary to get a declaration of identity—to prove the identity of the applicant with the person mentioned in the certificate, and this assistance could not be obtained save on payment. If, however, the operations of pension agents were not going to be prohibited they ought in his opinion to be carefully limited. To make the trade of pension agents a criminal offence was going too far; on the other hand it would be unwise to allow pension agents to make exorbitant charges, and the purpose which the mover of the Amendment had in view would be met if the costs were made irrecoverable, as they were under the Workmen's Compensation Act, unless certified as reasonable by the registrar of the County Court.

*MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) pointed out that there would also be extraordinary difficulty in many cases in calculating the means of applicants for pensions as required by Clause 4, and unless other people were allowed to do it for them he was afraid many poor persons would find the difficulties of Clause 4 insuperable. Many of them knew how difficult it was to do this for the purposes of the income-tax. If those calculations were not done carefully that might be the cause of pensions being refused which in other cases would be granted. The person, therefore, who carried through the application for a pension surely deserved something. It would be most difficult if the claim was successful to find out whether the assistance was given for a fee or reward, because if the payment was delayed for some months after the application was made and the pension was given it would be impossible to prove it. Personally he thought there was a very strong objection to the Amendment, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not accept it.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said that undoubtedly there were very difficult and complicated questions which would have to be determined before a pension could be secured. The questions were in some cases not only intrinsically difficult in themselves, but would be also difficult owing to the difficulty of tracing the relevant facts—where, for instance, persons were uncertain as to the place of their birth. It would be quite impossible for many of the poor people who ought to receive the benefits of the Bill to prepare unhelped whatever papers would be necessary. They would probably not understand the questions addressed to them on the Government form. They must have assistance, and the question was, how was that assistance to be given with the greatest advantage to the pensioner. There would always be a great deal of voluntary assistance where people went to seek it. He wished the Government would instruct the pension officer that it was part of his business to facilitate as much as he could the making of claims by *bona fide* applicants. The claim would be tested by him, but it should also be part of his duty to assist the applicant to set down the relevant facts. What he was afraid of was the people who might make it their business to tout for this work, because, although they might only make good claims, it was very questionable whether a great many bad claims would not be dressed up to pass muster. He was afraid that these touts, in the case of a good claim which, with a little voluntary assistance and a little application, would carry the pension, would tell the applicant: "You will not get your pension unless you put your claim in legal language." These persons were prone to believe these things when told by such people, and that would be unfortunate. If that were so, and if the clause went further than was intended, still there were very many interesting suggestions, a valuable one being that of the hon. Member below the gangway opposite. They had not heard the Government on that subject, but he thought it was well worthy of their attention, and he would like to know what their views were. He understood that the hon. Member would leave it to the Committee; he did not quite know what the hon. Member's suggestion was.

***MR. ELLIS DAVIES** said his suggestion was that no payment for work done in assisting an old person to obtain a pension was to be made, unless the registrar of the County Court certified the amount as reasonable.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that in this case there was no reference to the County Court. The Government had done their best to eliminate recourse to the law under the Bill, and had deliberately refused to grant any appeal to a Court of law for reasons which they had themselves set forth. Whether the registrar of the County Court would be the best authority to whom to go, he did not know; he did not profess to have knowledge enough to speak definitely on that subject. At any rate, if people were to be allowed to make a business of procuring pensions for old people. he suggested that their charges should be subject to disallowance, or, indeed, not recoverable unless allowed by some independent authority, whether the pension officer or the registrar of the County Court. He thought the point was worthy of consideration, and it might get them out of a difficulty which otherwise might lead to a great deal of hardship among poor people.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) thought hon. Gentlemen opposite were splitting straws on this question. This clause was entirely unnecessary, and might afford an opportunity for blackmailing if it were adopted. A poor person, who wanted his claim made out, might go to a recognised solicitor to get it prepared for him. After the solicitor had done the work, the poor person might repudiate his claim for payment, saying that the solicitor had touted for the business, and the unfortunate solicitor who had done the work might very likely be heavily fined, or possibly even sent to gaol.

Such a clause as that now proposed would really tend to blackmailing, and he was sure would have a very bad effect in the country at large. Hon. Members seemed to forget that it was a part of the Government scheme that there should be a pension committee and a pension officer, and he was sure that they might rest satisfied to leave the matter in their hands, and not endeavour to pass a clause of this sort which could only lead to complications and troubles in the future.

*MR. GEORGE D. FABER (York) said he could not but feel that a great difficulty surrounded this question when one put oneself into the position of a poor person who applied for the pension. The House must not forget that in regard to these pensions they were dealing largely with an uneducated class. That class would find itself surrounded at the very beginning by what an hon. Gentleman on that side of the House had pictorially described as "wire-entanglements." At every point, practically, there was a difficulty under the Bill. The first step was the production of the birth certificate. As had been pointed out, that was by no means an easy matter. It was no easy matter for an applicant in a low condition of life to prove where he was born. He was not referring to the case of an applicant in a country village, where people of position knew him. He was thinking, rather, of the applicant who lived in a slum of one of our great towns. Such an applicant often had not the remotest idea where he was born. He did not know what steps to take, not being a highly-educated man, and he could not make the application on his own initiative. On the point as to the birth certificate alone, he was content to rest his argument. The applicant, unable to take steps himself, must call in skilled advice, and unless he was careful he would fall into the pit. Suppose a professional tout took up his case. He would go to the poor man in the slums, and say, "You are over seventy years of age; I will prove it for you and get you a pension of 5s. a week, but you must give me some of it." The applicant would be at the mercy of the tout. If he did not employ him he would get nothing at all, and he was not able to protect himself. Therefore, they wanted to guard against his being at the mercy of the tout, and he understood that was the object of his hon. friend's clause. At the same time, he must frankly say that he did not think the clause as it stood met the case, because, although it sought to discountenance the professional tout, yet they all desired that the applicant should have the benefit of the Act. He would like to hear that a solicitor could be called in. But solicitors were only human, and they would require to be paid for their work. The solicitor might be the most honourable man in the world—as solicitors were in the great majority of cases—but he would expect to be paid for his work, and would of course be entitled to his remuneration. But there, again, they must be careful of the risk of overburdening the pension with legal expenses. The hon. Gentleman below the gangway opposite, a Member from one of the Welsh constituencies, had made a suggestion following on the lines of the Workmen's Compensation Act, that no costs for work done in assisting an applicant should be recoverable unless the registrar or Judge of the County Court certified that they were proper costs to be recovered. But under this Bill they were not concerned with the County Court. It was one of the anomalies of this measure that they had a dual authority, but neither part of it really judicial. First of all they had an officer who was called on the one hand a high Imperial officer, and on the other hand an Excise officer. As he had pointed out the other day when the Bill was in Committee, his function ceased when he had collected information about the applicant, and the pension committee were the judges, subject to the Local Government Board. Although he thought the suggestion of the hon. Member an admirable one, he did not see how it was going to be put in a Bill of this sort, unless they left the pension committee to decide whether the costs incurred were properly recoverable. He wished the Chancellor of the Exchequer would allow the clause to be read a second time, and then they could remedy its imperfections. He agreed that it would not do as it stood. But if they went forward and turned the Bill into an Act without doing anything at all to protect these poor applicants against the rapacity of a class that was certain to arise to take advantage of their weakness, he thought before long that they would find they had made a very grievous mistake.

*MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars) said that, having heard the arguments in support of this clause, he had come to the conclusion that he should be justified in opposing it and voting against it. He did not think that it had any real bearing on the question. As he understood it the reference was to services rendered for payment or reward. But they knew that these people would be assisted by trade union and other officials to get the pension, and there would be no question of payment or reward at all. As under the Workmen's Compensation Act, where they assisted applicants to get their claims put through without any thought of reward, so it would be under this Act. The Act might be left to be tried, and if it needed something of this sort, it might be drafted later on. As a matter of fact, most of the poor persons who applied for the pension would be on the Poor Law; probably 50 per cent. of those of seventy years of age would be on the Poor Law. The Poor Law guardians would in their own interest seek to keep old people off the Poor Law and get them on to the pension list. Then these pensions would very soon become known amongst the people, and he assumed the Treasury or someone else would make the necessary simple arrangements whereby the poor people might get assisted in making their claim. They would get a form at the Post Office which would be of the simplest possible description and instructions as to where the pension officer was located so that he would be available and probably readily accessible, and would instruct them how to get their pensions. There might, however, be some cases in which it would be necessary to get outside advice, and he would like to ask hon. Members above the gangway why not. He was not in favour of touting agents. He remembered when on the Departmental Committee inquiry into the Compensation Act a good deal of abuse was revealed, especially in the large industrial centres, where a certain kind of lawyer went about touting for cases. He wanted to avoid that and not encourage it, but why should they prevent trade unions or friendly societies of these old people if they thought proper from paying a man whose professional advice might be necessary and who might get them £13 per year? At all events it did not seem to be such a great danger, even if it were the case that in a few instances £3 might be exacted for the £13 per year. He was not disposed at that juncture to burden the Act and make it more complicated than it was by inserting the proposed clause. He would rather leave it to take its chance in the meantime, and then if these dangers were revealed he would be prepared to vote for such a clause.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said that all the difficulties on this matter really arose because the Government had not told them what machinery they intended to provide for getting pensions for these old people. The hon. Member who had just sat down had imagined a series of regulations which he thought the Government were going to put into force. The hon. Member might have seen those regulations which had been kept from the rest of the House, and in the absence of which it was quite impossible to estimate the machinery of the Bill. It might be a workable or an unworkable Bill. It entirely depended on the machinery. He found it very difficult to know how these people were going to succeed if they had no means of going to the supposed place of their birth, not accurately known to them. He was left in absolute perplexity as to whether they were doing the best thing for these old pensioners in having this clause or not. They were clearly doing the best for them in having such a clause in if some machinery was provided by the Government which would enable the investigation to be carried out. But they had not suggested that they were going to provide any machinery at all. He was not sure that his hon. friend's plan, however it might stop an acknowledged and admitted abuse, might not cause in some cases gross hardship and injustice to persons who could not prove their age without assistance, which they were not told as yet was going to be provided.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 82; Noes, 320. (Division List No. 174.)

AYES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, R. Lord (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn J.A.(Worc.
Clive, Percy Archer
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Gardner, Ernest
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'rd
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H
Kerry, Earl of
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R
Long,Col. Charles W.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Dublin,S)
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sheffield,SirBerkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Fell and Mr. George Faber.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell,Sir JH.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHn SirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Davies, Ellis Willam (Eifion)
Davies,M.Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickinson,W. H. (St.Pancras,N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale

Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N)
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H.(Denbighs
Robertson, Sir G Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt. Hn Sir Thomas P
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williamson, A.
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) moved to amend Clause 1 (right to receive old-age pension) by substituting 5s. a week as the amount of the pension in place of the sums set forth in the schedule. This Amendment, he said, was to form the basis of a subsequent Amendment he had on the Paper, and it would have the effect of introducing what he thought was a better test for the assignment of pensions than that contained in the Bill. At the top of page 18 of the Amendment Paper he had put down another Amendment which contained a true industrial test, on the lines of the German industrial test, but a little more humane. It required that a person should prove that during the three years preceding the day on which he completed the age of seventy, he was engaged in useful work for not less than 126 weeks, and that his earnings had not exceeded 20s. a week. He had placed the earnings as low as possible because he desired to keep well within the amount of money involved in this Bill, but he had no objection to a higher figure. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had complained that nobody would help him to reduce the expenditure, but this Amendment would save him at least £1,000,000 or £2,000,000, a year. At the same time the Amendment would establish a definite logical reason for giving pensions, and also clear away all the absurdities and anomalies in the schedule, which made the scheme difficult and would make it very unpopular. When the Government first introduced their scheme they put in it a fixed sum of 5s. a week. At that time the Prime Minister told them that after careful consideration the Government had come to the conclusion that a fixed sum of 5s. a week was the best. No reason had been given by the Government for abandoning that position. Under the proposed Amendment a man would receive a pension for the work he did, and not as a matter of charity. If that were done they would have no need to make inquiries as to character or income. If they proceeded not on the industry but on the charity test they must have all the anomalies in the schedule. In assessing the income the pension committee would have to take into account not only the actual cash but also hypothetical sources of income. Furniture was personal property, and under this scheme it would be necessary for the Excise man to visit the applicant's house to find out what furniture he possessed, and then make an estimate of the annual value of it. All that would be got rid of by fixing the sum at 5s. Take the case of the old man who helped his daughter to do the washing in return for a meal. That would have to be taken into account under this Bill and an estimate taken of its value. These were questions which would involve frightful heartburning. One man might say he had not been treated by the committee quite fairly, and another might say that the Exciseman had been bribed by his neighbour, and would not give him a pension because he had refused to bribe him. Clause 3 which dealt with character was unlimited as to time, whereas the Amendment was limited to three years. There was an enormous difference between going back upon the whole of a man's past history, and going back for only three years. According to the words of the Bill, before a man became entitled to a pension he must prove that he had not failed to work according to his opportunity or ability, during the whole of his life. All these absurdities and cruelties resulted from starting on a false basis and mixing up two distinct things. The advocates of the Bill talked about giving pensions to the veterans of industry, but the Bill itself said: "Give people pensions because they are poor," and the result was that they had to introduce all kinds of artificial stipulations. He proposed to limit the inquiries to three years. He might inform the Chancellor of the Exchequer that his Amendment would exclude a considerable number of people who did not deserve pensions but who would get them under the Bill. His proposal also had the advantage that it would not involve any inquiry into past character. The House had got to make up its mind whether it was going to give pensions as a reward for industry or as a subsidy to poverty. They did not at present reward poverty or misfortune. Poverty was not a crime; it was an inconvenience, an inability to satisfy one's wants, and that was itself its own punishment. If they treated poverty as a merit, as used to be done in the Middle Ages, they should not reward it, because if they set up a reward for poverty they deprived the poor man of his merit by giving him a reward. Honest poverty could only be dealt with by charity or the Poor Law. The Government professed that their whole object was to separate their scheme from the Poor Law. If so, why not adopt a pure industrial test, and give pensions as a reward for industry? The test he was proposing to apply would deal with the great difficulty raised by hon. Members opposite, namely, the refusal of a pension to a man because he happened to be in receipt of Poor Law relief after 1st January this year. Under his proposal nobody would be asked if they had received Poor Law relief. They would simply be asked if they had worked the requisite number of weeks. A man who had been working hard up to 1st January was, through temporary misfortune, obliged to accept Poor Law relief, and he was, therefore, to become disqualified for a pension. That was a very great hardship which would be got rid of entirely by the scheme he proposed. They should bear in mind that there was a distinction between Poor Law relief and pensions. They rewarded industry, they relieved poverty, the motives being different. They knew that without industry the world would come to an end, and in selfish interest they rewarded industry. They relieved poverty out of humanitarian feeling, but to relieve was not to reward. The Government Bill showed a hopeless confusion of ideas, and it actually contained a provision for rewarding idleness. [Cries of "No."] Yes, according to subsection (*b*), of Clause 3, a man was to work "according to his ability, opportunity, and need." What did the last word mean? If a man was in possession of an income that relieved him from the necessity to work, and that possession came to an end, he was to receive a pension. Why? If he had not done any work he was not entitled to a pension at the expense of his fellow citizens. Hon. Members might say that that did not often happen, but they forgot there were a number of people who, inheriting a small income, were content to fritter away their lives doing no work at all. Such a man he knew, who, instead of following the profession to which he had been trained, lived in a small room in a workmen's dwelling and did no work of any kind. That man invited himself and a friend to dine with him. He did his own cooking, cleaning, and everything. During the repast he told them the cost of every single article. He said he bought butter at 10d. per lb. He himself and his fellow guest said they wanted no butter. He contended that it was not the duty of the House to encourage such a man in leading an idle life. It was the duty of every man to work. But the Labour Party had voted in a mass for this clause which would give a man a pension simply because his income came to an end. A man who received from the community and made no return was a parasite on the community. It was curious that the Socialist Party while declaring their anxiety to get pensions for the veterans of industry voted for pensions for parasites. Hon. Members opposite must painfully feel the contrast in their attitudes inside and outside the House. Outside on a hundred platforms they spent their energies in denouncing the Liberal Party and all its works, proclaiming that they alone possessed the key to social salvation. But in the House they sat cooing like doves in spring time, sitting in patient expectancy ready to eat out of the hand of the Government and to take all that was in it.

SIR F. BANBURY seconded the Amendment. He was not sure that he agreed with the first part of it, because, if it were adopted, he thought it would be necessary to abolish the sliding scale. But the hon. Member's argument in regard to the rest of the Amendment was so good that the House could not allow it to go by without some attention. It was exceedingly unfortunate when they were discussing these questions that they had not the advantage of the attendance of the Members of the Labour Party. He understood that they were attending a garden party yesterday when the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill was being discussed. It was a pity that they could not give attendance when serious business was being transacted in the House. The test of work to which his hon. friend had alluded was the best test which could possibly be imposed. It would be difficult in many cases, especially in towns, to find out whether the statements of a person applying for a pension were true, but it would be comparatively easy to find out whether a person had been working for a certain number of years. He would like to know why the Government had not brought forward some provision of that sort. They must not forget that the original idea of the Government was that the pension should be 5s. a week, irrespective of the pension scale, and he did not know that the House had heard any very serious or satisfactory reason from the Government for abandoning that idea. He hoped his hon. friend would not press the first part of the Amendment to a division.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out the words 'set forth in Part I. of the schedule to this Act,' and to insert the words 'of 5s. a week.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'set forth in' stand part of the Bill."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the hon. Baronet had seconded an Amendment of which he had repeatedly told the House he disapproved. The only point now before the House was the abolition of the sliding scale and a return to a fixed limit. The Amendment asked the House to set up an alternative scheme totally distinct from that of the Government, and he questioned whether it was in order.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Amendment now on the Paper is clearly in order because it proposes to give a pension of 5s. a week. It would not, therefore, impose any extra charge, but it would diminish the charge. When we get to the Amendments to other parts of the clause, I shall have some further statement to make.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said his difficulty was this. The whole of the speech of the hon. Member for Preston was devoted to an Amendment which clearly seemed to be out of order. If he had argued in favour of the restoration of the rigid limit of 5s. a week and the elimination of the sliding scale, he could have understood him, but he had not done that. He had set up an alternative scheme which was certainly out of order at that stage.

*MR. SPEAKER: I really do not know whether the alternative scheme would mean an increased charge or not, and I have no figures at my disposal, and I have no means of arriving at any figures which would indicate to me whether that would be so or not. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is the only man in this House who really has the figures at his disposal, and if the right hon. Gentleman tells the House that the scheme proposed by the hon. Member for Preston will, in his judgment, increase the charge, I should be bound to accept that statement. If he makes that statement, I shall then be prepared to rule out the alternative suggestion.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he was not prepared to say it would increase the charge; he thought that, on the whole, it would diminish the cost. He assumed, therefore, the Amendment was in order. The hon. Member would excuse him if he declined to follow him at the present moment into the various criticisms which he had placed before the House. As to the scheme on its merits, the hon. Gentleman wanted to confine the benefits of the Bill to persons who earned 20s. a week for three years immediately preceding the day on which he completed the age of seventy—that was preceding his application for a pension. He took issue on that; it would practically exclude all labourers in towns. On the previous night the scheme had been severely condemned because it was a purely country scheme, and that the town labourer would not benefit by it. Of course, it was said that a very small proportion of town labourers attained the age of seventy. The rate of wages of a town labourer at that age would not reach the rate fixed by his hon. friend's Amendment, and therefore the town labourer would be swept away. But there was another reason why he could not accept his hon. friend's scheme. The hon. Member had said that the workman before applying for a pension must have worked for forty-two weeks in each of the preceding three years. There was no allowance for sickness, no allowance for the effects of old age, no allowance for accidents. The applicant must prove that he had worked 126 weeks between the age of sixty-seven and seventy; that he had worked regularly for forty-two weeks in each year and had earned 20s. a week. Was that a reasonable demand to make upon an old man? He was surprised that his hon. friend had put forward such a scheme. He could understand the hon. Gentleman opposing the whole scheme, but he could not understand his saying that he wished to provide for a certain number of old people getting a pension, while submitting a scheme which ruled out the town labourer and if applied to the country labourer would be harsh and cruel. For that reason alone he would rule the Amendment out of court. His hon. friend had talked a great deal about thrift, and in the course of the Second Reading of the Bill he proposed an Amendment based on thrift. But what was to happen to a thrifty person in a case of this kind? Let them suppose he had not saved enough to carry him on till he was seventy years of age, but that by doing a little work during harvest, or by planting his potatoes, or by looking after his own little allotment, he kept off the Poor Law: his hon. friend said that not a 1d. of a pension was that old man to get. And why? Because he had not worked forty-two weeks in each of the preceding years before he was seventy, and had not earned 20s. a week. And then in the case of a thrifty town labourer, if he broke down at the age of sixty-eight, he was to be ruled out also. He really could not accept the Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said that if the right hon. Gentleman had devoted the same talent to his own tests that he had devoted to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Preston, he would have torn them to pieces. He quite agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and could not support the test proposed by the hon. Member for Preston; but when they came to examine every test proposed in the Bill by the right hon. Gentleman they were exposed to the same style of criticism. Those who had given attention to the Bill agreed with the hon. Member for Preston while he was explaining to the House how utterly unjust were the proposals of the Government; but when the hon. Member set up a scheme of his own, he confessed that the hon. Member failed to convince him. Moreover, the hon. Gentleman had said that the claimant for a pension must prove that he had been "engaged in useful work." That meant that they were to entrust the Imperial officer or the pension committee with the task of deciding whether the claimant's work had been useful or not. They would decide the matter in precisely the same way as the board of guardians decided whether Poor Law relief was to be given. That was the reason why he was opposed to all those tests. There was no alternative between a contributory scheme and a universal scheme; and he was sure that all who supported the scheme of the Bill would suffer for it very severely in the estimation of their fellow-countrymen.

Amendment negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out the words 'Part I. of.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question, "That the words 'Part I. of' stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

LORD R. CECIL, on Clause 2, moved to insert words requiring the claimant to "prove that he has" attained the pensionable age. His object was to learn from the Government by what machinery they proposed to secure that only those who had actually attained the age of seventy should receive a pension. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them that they were all reckless and irresponsible persons and that their Amendments would throw additional cost on the Exchquer. He ventured to say that no one of them was as reckless and irresponsible as the Government, who had made their calculations as to cost on the theory that only those who were seventy years of age would receive pensions. It must be obvious that it would be exceedingly difficult to ascertain whether a man was seventy years of age or not. He did not know how it was to be done. Some hon. Members seemed to think that the Bill would only affect the country, but that was not the case. And how would it affect the towns? It was the commonest thing for an old labourer not to live for a considerable time in the neighbourhood in which he was born, and how was he going to prove his age? The English Registration Act only came into force in 1836, and if they looked into the figures of registration of births it would be found that in the early years an exceedingly small proportion of births were registered. Even now quite a considerable number of the population — something like 20 or 30 per cent.—were never registered; and the percentage registered must have been much smaller seventy years ago. How were they going to prove a claimant's age? Were they going to take the old man's word for it? Even supposing the men were perfectly honest a large number of them had an exceedingly vague notion of how old they really were. Was it all to be left to regulations? He thought the House was entitled to know the nature of the evidence which the Government contemplated requiring before admitting a claim. Was the Imperial officer to prove negatively as well as positively whether a man was seventy? If so, he would have all his work cut out. He would have to ascertain the date of birth, and send for the register, and if the man's name was not in it he would have to get up evidence the same as in a pedigree case. Everybody must see the difficulty. The result would be that anybody who looked about seventy years of age would get his pension, although he might be only sixty or sixty-five. He thought they were in for a very much larger expenditure under this scheme than the Chancellor of the Exchequer had allowed for. He begged to move.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 21, to leave out the word 'have,' and insert the words 'prove that he has.'"—*(Lord R. Cecil.)*

Lord R. Cecil.

Question proposed, "That the word 'have' stand part of the Bill."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) said that the noble Lord had answered his own case for his own Amendment. He had pointed out with great force and justice that there were many cases in which it was impossible for a claimant to prove his birth. No doubt there were many people in the United Kingdom whose birth was not registered. The Registration Act of 1836 did not come into force all at once, but at different times. He believed that it came into force in Scotland and Ireland at a later date. He had not the exact figures in his mind as to when the registration of births began, but there must be many cases in which it would be impossible to produce a certificate of birth. The noble Lord would surely not wish to make it a statutory enactment that no man, however old he might be, was to be unable to receive a pension unless he could produce a certificate of birth. Yet under this Amendment the applicant would either have to produce a certificate or call his parents, who *ex hypothesi* would not be available for the purpose. In truth when the Bill came into operation there would be many cases in which no sort of proof would be required, because the pension committee in the neighbourhood would know that the applicant was very old. It was left entirely to them, but not without some guidance from the central authority, because the noble Lord would observe that Section 10 provided that rules might be made as to the evidence that would be required. It would be undesirable to indicate in the Bill what the regulations should be, but the rules would no doubt require to be very carefully considered as to the kind of evidence the pension committee should be required to accept in the absence of a birth certificate. It would be undesirable that he should indicate now what line those rules would take, but obviously it would be most undesirable to put every applicant to the strict proof. It was much better to leave the matter somewhat wide. No doubt the absence of proof would necessitate the giving of pensions to men who were not seventy, but in such cases it would be given to persons who looked and appeared to be seventy, and the injustice done in those cases would be very rare.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN quite agreed with the Attorney-General that all applicants could not be expected to give such proof as would be required in a Court of law as to their age. The Amendment of the noble Lord, however, was directed to ascertaining from the Government what they had in their mind as to the character of the proof the pension officer and the pension committee might properly exact. He agreed that it would be undesirable to give in a clause of the Bill the exact regulations which these different authorities should follow, but he differed from the hon. and learned Gentleman when he said it was not desirable to indicate to the House what those regulations would be. It was most desirable that somebody on behalf of the Government should indicate what evidence should be received. The effect of leaving the matter to the pension committee and the pension officer would be that anybody who did not clearly appear on evidence not to be seventy would be treated as seventy. That would be the result if there were no special regulations. He did not believe the Government had considered any one of the regulations they had to frame under the Bill, and the reason why the hon. and learned Gentleman thought it was not expedient to give the regulations was because he did not know—because he had not the slightest idea of what they were. There had never been such a Bill in which greater power had been given to departmental authorities to use regulations under it or which gave them so much authority as this. They could exclude or include whoever they liked. This was one of many discussions which illustrated the difficulties of the scheme the Government were laying before the House. Anybody would have thought that in a non-contributory scheme as in a contributory one, they would have arrived at some simple plan by which it could be ascertained whether a man was entitled to a pension or not, but that idea was dispelled by the debates that had taken place. The clauses of the Bill were full of ambiguities and doubt. In this case the test was one most difficult and in many cases impossible of proof as proof was regarded in a Court of law. They had to trust to the local authority, and for that reason the Government had to issue regulations which, when they came to draw them up, they would find would have to be loose and vague. That meant that practically the pension committee would have an absolute discretion in individual cases as to whom they would admit and whom not. That being the case the public interest in the discussion, from his point of view, centred in its bearing on the expense to which the country would be put under the scheme. The estimates the Government had made were mere guess-work by Government officials instructed to look at a particular proposal and say what would be its cost. How were those officials set to work; what data had they before them? Surely those were matters the House ought to know something about. As he understood, they had found out from certain data that there were so many people of a certain age in this country. They had taken a census of particular places in order to ascertain how many of these old people would come within the scope of the scheme, and they assumed for the purposes of their calculations that the number of people of seventy would remain about the same and that the incomes of those people would continue the same. If he were right and those were the underlying assumptions of all the estimates put forward, the estimates were not worth having. Until the Bill came into operation it was not worth anybody's while to make himself out to be other than he really was. It had been to the man's interest to make himself out to be younger. It was now to the interest of these people in a doubtful case to make out that they were seventy. There was no desire to deprive these old people of the income they received, but there would be no incentive now to those who had contributed towards it to continue to do so. The financial basis on which the Bill was built would be destroyed, for the right hon. Gentleman, who had admitted in the City that he had a thumping deficit, would find that that deficit was far larger than he had anticipated.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said the speech of the right hon. Gentleman had not carried them any further along the road of meeting this Amendment. One would assume that the amount of the cost had been calculated from the Census returns of the people of the age of seventy. He did not know how long the census papers were kept, but it certainly occurred to him that the knowledge that the census papers were in existence would deter people from making false statements as to their age. It was obvious that when the last census was compiled no man had any interest in making himself out to be older than he was. No man could foresee that the Government in a few years were going to bring in a scheme whereby he would get a pension, so that he had not that inducement to put forward his age a few years. Surely the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down betrayed an almost childish innocence in connection with Acts of Parliament if he imagined that they could put into a Bill a series of cleverly drafted regulations and elaborate tests by which to get proof of a man's age. The details must be left to the local committee and to the pension officer. According to the Amendment of the noble Lord the *onus probandi* was put upon the old man, who was to prove that he was seventy years of age. That was surely taking the matter very far indeed. The Attorney-General had referred to the fact that compulsory registration of births had not commenced in England until 1836, and in Ireland not until 1860; so that an old man of eighty or ninety in Ireland would not be able to prove from that source that he had reached the age of seventy. It would mean that in Ireland they practically excluded from the operation of the Act every old man or woman in the country, because they could bring forward no proof. The noble Lord's Amendment, if adopted, would practically exclude from this beneficial scheme people in Ireland of seventy, seventy-five, eighty, ninety years of age, and even centenarians, who could bring forward no legal proof of the kind required. But it was reasonable to suppose that the local committee, with such evidence as they would be able to get from other old people, from Ted, or Jack, or other aged persons, would be able to obtain fairly satisfactory proof if the applicant had reached the age of seventy. He hoped the noble Lord would not press the Amendment.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said that if it had been the object of the hon. Member who had just sat down to make clear the point of his noble friend, he had singularly failed in his object. He had said in the first place that it would be an intolerable hardship to all old persons who applied for the pension that they should have to prove they were of the age of seventy. The Attorney General had also complained of the Amendment as imposing a hardship. It was a hardship imposed by the Bill.

SIR W. ROBSON: I said by the Amendment.

MR. BOWLES said that the Amendment had been moved with the desire of eliciting from the Government what they themselves understood to be the meaning and effect of their own Bill, and it was because they had no conception, at any rate which they could express to the House, of what was the effect of the first and main provision of their own Bill, that, for his part, he regarded the Amendment as serving a very useful purpose. The Attorney-General had said they might leave this matter to the regulations. Were those regulations under Clause 10 to prescribe the evidence to be required in order to fulfil the statutory conditions? But what evidence could there be of the age of a person except either the birth certificate or such overwhelming proof as would satisfy any reasonable person? Unless the Government had considered the point the Bill as it stood merely amounted to this, that any person who alleged he was seventy was to be entitled to the pension. It appeared to him that that was a matter which the Government was bound to have considered, and if they had not considered it they were sadly lacking in their duty to the House. The hon. Member below the gangway had made the suggestion, he imagined humourously, that it should be sufficient evidence if each applicant referred to the Census paper which he had filled up with regard to his age. But the hon. Member must know that such a declaration could not be held binding as to the applicant's age. The man might say: "It is quite true that it states I was sixty-two or sixty-three, but it was a clerical error; it was a mistake; I was under sixty, and the statement was filled up at a time when I had no contemplation of such a scheme as this." No man could be held to such a declaration under the present scheme. The House was confronted with a proposal by which vast sums of public money were to be given to a particular class of persons. The main condition on which a pension was to be given was that the recipient should have reached the age of seventy. The Government were asked what assurance there was that pensions would not be given outside that age, and to people who were merely lying in order to obtain the grant. The Government had not the slightest notion; they did not know in the least. They had not even considered how old age was to be proved; all they said was that at some time or other they would make regulations—regulations which must be nugatory and ridiculous unless they insisted upon getting evidence which would satisfy all reasonable men. If the regulations would do that the Government ought to tell them what they were. This matter was of essential and vital importance, and if the Government had not really a considered opinion upon it, then it was a striking comment on the condition of mind in which they had thrown this gigantic scheme on the Table of the House, and was a complete justification of the Amendment.

*MR. BARNES said it appeared to him that the whole thing was in a nutshell as regarded the Amendment. He was going to vote against it, for the very simple reason that it seemed to him to increase the difficulty of an old person's getting a pension. He had tried to realise what would be the thoughts of an intending applicant. He could conceive of an old person making a claim for a pension, and the flow of his thoughts would be in the direction of getting his age adequately ascertained. In the trade unions the members names and ages were registered. He was secretary to a body of men numbering 112,000, and the age of every one was recorded. Perhaps 1,000,000 men in the last twenty years had been registered in this way, and he had only to look back over the books to ascertain the name and age of a man. That was one means which might be open to a person for proving his age. He did not say that it would be considered satisfactory evidence by the committee or pension officer; it might be or might not be. Then there were friendly societies, who also registered the ages of their members, and they had the *data* which covered hundreds of thousands, he supposed millions, of the population of the country, among them men and women who would be making applications for pensions. The Bill was sufficiently open, it appeared to him, to admit of that being done. But if this Amendment were carried, the first statutory condition imposed by the Bill would be that a person applying for the pension must prove that he was of the age of seventy. The pension officer might say that was not a duty devolving upon him, or the committee, or anybody else, but upon the applicant, and until he proved he was seventy years of age, no other step could be taken in the way of getting the pension. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment had himself answered his own case, because he had piled up difficulty upon difficulty, pointing out that there was no registration in this country until 1836, and none in Ireland until 1860. These were all proofs that the matter of proving whether a person was seventy years of age was one of some complication. From his own point of view, that seemed to destroy the Amendment. He wanted that difficulty to be got over, not by the poor person of seventy, eighty, or ninety years of age, but by the Government, who had all the means at their disposal, and who were, as he understood, by Clause 10, making provision for it. That clause provided that regulations should be drawn up with a view to providing what should be taken as proper evidence, and that would get over the point. For his part he would rather have seen the regulations. It might be that the Government were culpable, but he was not going to enter into that at all. They would all be very much better informed, of course, if they knew what those regulations were. But he was not going to make their not having them a reason for setting up another barrier to persons getting the pension. As it was, poor old men and women would get some help under the Bill in making their claims somehow or other, and he believed they would be provided for.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down seemed to have inadvertently misinterpreted the speech of his noble friend in introducing the Amendment. His noble friend had explicitly stated that his object in moving the Amendment was to obtain from the Government some clear exposition of what their policy was in respect of the evidence on which they were to arrive at the conclusion that the applicants for pensions had reached the age of seventy years. That was a perfectly legitimate and proper Parliamentary procedure, and the only criticism he had to make upon it was that his noble friend had formed a far too sanguine estimate of the knowledge which the Government possessed of their own policy and their own Bill. When he put down his Amendment in order to obtain a clear exposition from the Government of what was intended, his noble friend, with all the experience which he should have obtained of their discussions in these days, must have known that he was undertaking what was pre-doomed to failure. That was the absolute and clear outcome of the attempt which his noble friend had made. He wanted to ask the House to compare the Attorney-General's estimate of the kind of evidence which would be taken from the man of seventy with the kind of statistics on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer based his calculation of what would be the cost of the scheme. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had admitted that the age ought to be below seventy, but said he could not afford it. But he was going to be obliged to afford it after the statement of the Attorney-General. It clearly appeared that there was no possible mechanism provided which would prevent people under the age of seventy asking for pensions. Therefore all the financial calculations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been upset by his own Attorney-General. He did not know that it could be avoided. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had said the Government were going by regulation to say what the evidence was to be—those mysterious regulations which were to solve all the difficulties of the future which the Government were incapable of dealing with. But even Treasury regulations would not manufacture evidence if evidence did not exist. Let them make their regulations with all the care they pleased, when there was no evidence no evidence would be forthcoming, and it was therefore perfectly obvious that with regard to the age of seventy all their precautions were utterly illusory. There was also a great inequality in the way in which this would act. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had told them there would be clear *prima facie* evidence with regard to the age of every member of a trade union or a friendly society, because persons joining them had to make some declaration in respect to their age. He supposed in the main the people who made these declarations made them quite honestly, but he took it that if they had a preference it was to make themselves out younger than they were. If that was so, evidently the members of friendly societies and trade unions would suffer if that was the only evidence forthcoming. They would really have reached the age of seventy in certain cases earlier than the declaration which they had made to the friendly society would seem to indicate. But let them take other classes of society—for instance the Irish population, where there was absolutely no evidence as to whether they were seventy or not, and no means of ascertaining except by a general estimate, such as whether they looked it or not. They would get the benefit of the doubt. A quite disproportionate stream of the national benevolence would flow into their pockets, compared with that which would flow into the pockets of members of trade unions and friendly societies. That was a very great injustice. The injustice would also be against the country and in favour of those classes in the towns which did not belong to trade unions and friendly societies, because in the country there was very likely evidence easily ascertainable as to what a person's age really was, and these persons would not be able to claim to be seventy before they were seventy. But take a person in town. It had been stated and never contradicted by the Government that in the case, not of the superior workman who belonged to a trade union or benefit society, but of the unorganised labourer and the poorer members of the working classes, evidence would not be forthcoming and, of course, the benefit of the doubt would always be given in favour of the claimant. If the country could afford it, he agreed entirely in favour of its being given, but they had been told all through that the country could not afford it, and that the age of seventy was the lowest possible limit which the resources of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would permit. They had great reason to complain that on this, which was the first opportunity which they had really had of trying to find out what the Government method was of dealing with this most complicated and difficult question, they found these two statements put forward and uncontradicted by the Government, he believed, incapable of contradiction, first that this want of principle would act greatly in favour of certain classes of the community as against others, and secondly that it would act against the Exchequer and throw upon those who were responsible for the finances of the country a burden which the present holder of that office said the country could not bear. In these circumstances the result of his noble friend's inquiry into the policy and motives of the Government had been singularly unsuccessful. But what he had succeeded in showing, and what was worth showing again, was that the Government had not thought out their Bill or the method in which it was going to work with regard to different classes of the community, and had not the smallest conception of what its operation was to be on the future of the national finances.

MR. FELL said he wished to add a word on behalf of a class who were rarely mentioned in these debates. The bulk of the pensioners under the Bill would be old women. He believed the whole Bill had been founded on New Zealand precedent and practice. The magistrates in New Zealand had to ascertain the age of these would-be pensioners after hearing evidence—no doubt legal evidence, either birth certificates or secondary evidence by other parties who could prove the age of these people. There was no machinery for arriving at the age of applicants in this Bill in any way analogous to that which obtained in New Zealand, and which he believed was found to give satisfaction. If there was to be any machinery set up by the regulations, he hoped it would define a way of arriving at the ages of these old women who would find the greatest difficulty in proving their ages under the Bill.

LORD R. CECIL said he desired to withdraw the Amendment, and in doing so he hoped they would hear no more about irresponsibility from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. McARTHUR (Liverpool, Kirkdale), in moving, said the object of the Amendment, to add at the end of Clause 2, "Provided that in the case of a British sailor residence in the United Kingdom shall be deemed to include service on board a vessel registered in the United Kingdom," was to adapt the concluding words of sub-clause (2) to the case of sailors. The subsection said that a person in order to have a pension must have been for twenty years a British subject living in the United Kingdom. That was all very well so far as workers on land were concerned; but how were they to deal with the case of a sailor? Residence for twenty years in the United Kingdom was clearly not applicable to his case. The object of the Amendment was to provide that service on a ship registered in the United Kingdom should be considered as residence in the United Kingdom. That seemed a reasonable way out of the matter. If a sailor was a British subject, and worked on a British ship for twenty years, he was as much entitled to a pension as a miner or any other labourer. It would be a great hardship if he were cut out, because no man was more useful to the State than the British sailor, and no man was less able to provide for his old age, for often he found his only refuge, when too old to go to sea, in the workhouse. In the New Zealand Act this point was specially provided for by words similar to these, which provided that a sailor employed on a ship belonging to the Colony should be entitled to a pension. He would perhaps be told that this could be met by regulation under the Act, but that was not the case. Regulations under the Act could not go beyond the terms of the Act. They could not vary the terms of an Act by regulation. They might make exceptions as to residence, but they could not provide that a foreign country or foreign waters should be deemed to be the United Kingdom, or say that when a sailor was at sea he was in the United Kingdom. He could quite believe that the Government did not wish to exclude sailors, but he submitted that they could not draw regulations which would bring in sailors. Trinity House granted certain pensions, and there was an association in Liverpool which granted small pensions to sailors, but, of course, under the Bill those would be taken as income. He hoped the Government would deal with this point satisfactorily by making it perfectly clear that the case of the sailor was not to be excluded. He begged to move.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) seconded. He said that knowing the sympathetic action of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to the Merchant Shipping Bill, he was sure that it would not be his intention to exclude seamen from the benefits of a Pensions Bill. They were all agreed that the British sailor was one of our most valuable national assets, and they ought not to do anything which would make him feel that he was placed at any disadvantage compared with any other inhabitants in reference to the advantages he was entitled to derive from the finances of the country. If they differentiated with regard to services abroad, they would at once place a disadvantage upon the manning of ships, and place the sailor in an invidious position, and just at the end of his life he would be placed at a decided disadvantage.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, at the end, to insert the words, 'provided that in the case of a British sailor residence in the United Kingdom shall be deemed to include service on board a vessel registered in the United Kingdom.'"—(*Mr. McArthur*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

SIR W. ROBSON said he scarcely needed to assure hon. Members that the Government had every intention of including seamen within the scope of the Bill. Seamen, however, were only one of many classes who pursued their avocation abroad. There were soldiers as well as sailors, and workmen who were sent abroad to execute large contracts for docks and railways who occasionally had to remain abroad for seven years. Those cases would be sure to come up to be dealt with, and the most convenient course to adopt would be to give to the word "residence" a meaning which would include them all. It was quite within the power of those who formed the rules to provide that service on board a British ship on the part of a British subject should be brought within the Act under the term "residence." The Government would certainly take care that all those great classes should be included within the scope of the Bill.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he had an Amendment to include soldiers. He understood from the Attorney-General that soldiers would be included.

SIR W. ROBSON: Yes. For the Government to select one particular class for specific treatment would throw doubt upon their power to deal with these classes by regulation.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he understood that this Amendment would be accepted. He was glad of that, because it was about the only common sense Amendment the Opposition had proposed. The hon. Gentleman above the gangway said in his Amendment that "residence" should be taken to mean service on board a ship registered in the United Kingdom. There were a great many British subjects who served on ships not registered under the British flag at all, who did good service to this country. A good deal of British trade was done on ships which did not fly the British flag although very often the crews were largely British subjects resident in this country. According to this Amendment those men in their deserving old age would be deprived of their pension simply because the ships they served on were not registered in this country. British sailors who served in ships registered abroad ought to be treated in the same way as other British sailors, and should not be debarred from receiving old-age pensions.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that this was one of those Amendments which produced agreement on all sides. He wanted to ask a further question. He had in his mind the case of men serving in the British mercantile marine. The Attorney-General said it would be possible to define "residence in the United Kingdom" so as to cover the case of a man who was domiciled here, but who was serving on a British ship or serving in the Army on a foreign station. But that did not cover all the cases. There were a number of sailors who were not domiciled here, and they would have to add an entirely novel definition of domicile to cover their case. When he was at the Admiralty there were many more Colonial dockyards than now and from time to time it was the practice to call for volunteers in the Home yards to proceed to a Colonial station, take up residence there, and work in His Majesty's dockyard abroad. In those cases the men closed their homes here altogether, and moved abroad. He thought those were cases which certainly ought to be covered, and there would be a number of them in the military service. He would like to know whether it would be within the power of the Government by means of regulations not only to define "residence" in the United Kingdom as including a man who was domiciled here, but also to include a man who had been forced to change his domicile in pursuance of public or private service.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) asked whether Members of the House would have an opportunity of seeing the regulations which were to be drawn up under the Act, and, if so, when they were likely to see them.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) said he wished to ask the Solicitor-General one question affecting soldiers. If a man who had been discharged as a time-expired soldier in India, and who had gone to work on the railways, or in some other occupation, returned home at the age of sixty or sixty-five, having been absent for forty years, would he come within the scope of the rules and regulations proposed to be drawn up ?

MR. BOWLES said the hon. and learned Gentleman had told them that this matter would be dealt with by regulations. He agreed with the hon. Gentlemen below the gangway that it would be more convenient for all of them, although less for the Government, if the regulations were put before the House in order that they might find out what they were discussing. All they could do was to ask such questions as they thought important in order to find out on what principle the regulations would be framed. The hon. and learned Gentleman had stated that the case of the sailor could be met by regulations made under the Bill. He himself had some doubt about it. Regulations could not be made which would conflict with the directions of the Act. Suppose that a man over fifty who was serving as a merchant seaman gave up his home in this country, and had nothing which could be regarded as a home or domicile here, and that he went off for three or four years on a long cruise, under the Bill as it stood it would be perfectly impossible to make regulations, or, if made, to enforce them, which would enable such a man to get a pension at all. Whatever might be the sailor's qualifications in other respects he could not say, and no regulation could make it possible for him to say, that he had for twenty years had a residence in this country prior to the date when, in other circumstances, he would be entitled to a pension. That was a person the House would not desire to exclude, and they were entitled to some better assurance than had been given that the Government would do their best to deal with the case by regulations.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH Fifeshire, E.): was understood to say that in the case put by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire no change was contemplated.

MR. CARLILE (Hertforshire, St. Albans) urged the Government to make some alteration in the wording of the Bill. It was perfectly clear in the Bill as it stood that persons must have their residence in the country in order to be entitled to pensions. Local committees would have no power to go outside of the actual wording of the Bill. This was a matter which affected a large number of people who had peculiar claims on the country.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was sure the House would feel that they must ask the Government questions in regard to the meaning of these words, because they had not the regulations before them, and there appeared to be no prospect of obtaining them, or that the pious wishes of the hon. Member for Sunderland would receive early fulfilment. The representative of the Government nodded approval when the hon. Member for East Clare suggested that British sailors serving on foreign ships should have pensions just as if they were serving on British ships. He did not know whether that approving nod was intended to commit the Government to that proposition, and he would like an explicit answer. They must have a strong case, and he wished to know whether the Government did say so. Even more strong than the case of the man serving on a foreign ship was the case of the engine driver on an Indian railway. He was, after all, on British territory. He was not serving abroad. An English sailor on a foreign ship was really in foreign territory and earning his livelihood in foreign territory, and his case was really extremely doubtful, but they could not exclude such a case as he put, namely, the British engine driver serving on an Indian railway. The Government must have thought out all these matters, although they had not been able to give the House the regulations in which they had embodied the results of their reflections. He thought they should answer these questions.

MR. HAVELOCK WILSON (Middlesbrough) thought that a British sailor serving on a British ship was in British territory.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the case put by the hon. Member for East Clare was that of a British sailor serving on a British ship.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said his point was that it was to the interest very often of this State that certain ships which were not registered in this country as British ships should be largely manned by British sailors. There were many cases where that was so. He submitted that in cases of that kind a British sailor should not, on returning home in his old age, be debarred from receiving a pension simply because he had not served on a British ship.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that was entirely a question of domicile. There were cases where a sailor was serving on board a foreign ship—and as a rule it was a foreign ship in the ownership of which there was a large British interest—and for all practical purposes it was a British-owned ship. In that case it was entirely a question of domicile—whether the sailor really had his home in this country or whether he had settled down altogether in another country, say, in the United States of America. If a British sailor serving on board an American ship had settled down in America and become an American citizen, he should not receive a pension in this country. But supposing he was serving on a Brazilian ship, a vessel which was really a British-owned ship, but which in order to conform to certain regulations flew the Brazilian flag. The real question was whether the sailor was still a British subject with a British domicile. That was largely a question of law. He wished the right hon. Gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, had seen the New Zealand regulations. They were very vague, because they were intended to leave a good deal of latitude for the many cases which must arise. The right hon. Gentleman had complained that the Government had not thought out, not the two or three cases which he had suggested, but the thousand and one cases which might arise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Classes of cases.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said there were not so many classes of cases. The big classes must be thought out. Besides the cases of the soldier and the sailor, there was the case of the man who went out to serve under a British contract. It might be for three or four years. It might be in South America, India, China, or Mexico. There were many cases of that kind where British subjects could be serving abroad. There were hundreds of decisions of the Courts dealing with matters of that kind. The Act of Parliament only provided for the making of regulations.

MR. GRETTON (Rutland) said that the only answer the right hon. Gentleman had given was similar to that given by the Attorney-General in regard to one particular section of the Bill. In his view, power should only be taken to make regulations for cases which had not been foreseen. He thought it was unfortunate that the Government had not placed the New Zealand Act and regulations on the Table; that would have been a great convenience, as they had been so often referred to. He submitted that it would be wise to pass the Amendment, and he would support it if his hon. friend went to a division. There was a very common case which, it appeared to him, had not yet been considered by the Government. He referred to the case of the seaman, a single man, who spent practically the whole of his life at sea. His home had passed away; he had no family connections with whom he could usually stay when ashore. How could they define a domicile for a man of that description? And it would be very hard to deprive him of a pension when he reached the age which would entitle him to it, and when he might have much more need of it than many other men who received pensions.

SIR F. BANBURY said that the right hon. Gentleman had referred them again to the New Zealand regulations. He did not want to see the New Zealand regulations. He was not going to get a pension under the New Zealand Act, nor was he going to pay towards pensions under that Act. What he did want to see were the regulations which were going to affect him as a taxpayer and his fellow countrymen as recipients of pensions. The right hon. Gentleman had told them about a ship owned by an English company but which sailed under the Brazilian flag. Did the right hon. Gentleman say that the regulations could alter the law of the land? That ship was a Brazilian vessel, no matter who owned it. The right hon. Gentleman acknowledged the difficulty of a seaman on board such a ship, and said that the regulations would meet it. In his opinion the only way to meet the difficulty was to put something in the Bill. They should really know what they were doing before they passed the Bill. At the present moment they did not know in the least who was to frame the regulations based on some other regulations passed by another country. This was the great object lesson in passing legislation in an abortive manner, and he sincerely hoped they would never again have such a measure.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) pointed out that domicile was one thing and residence another. There were thousands of people domiciled in England who were resident abroad, and there were thousands who were resident in England but who were domiciled abroad. An hon. Member who spoke on the part of seamen seemed to think that a seaman who spent all his life abroad on a foreign ship could yet be resident in England. He was quite mistaken. All the regulations could do was to define residence; nobody could define residence so as to be synonymous with domicile. An Amendment of this kind was required in order to bring British seamen into the Bill.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) thought the Amendment was of the utmost importance, and he pressed the Government to reconsider the decision arrived at by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was perfectly confident that unless the Amendment was accepted great hardship would be inflicted on a vast number of English sailors. The Government did not seem to realise what the effect of their own Bill was going to be. Everyone who was connected with the shipping trade and had the interest of the English sailors at heart, should press the Government to say more clearly than they had done why it was that they would not accept the Amendment. The regulations of other countries had nothing to do with the House; what they wanted to know was what the Government's regulations were going to be. He made a final appeal to the Prime Minister to reconsider the decision to which the Government had come in order to obviate what would be a great hardship to many seamen.

Mr. ASQUITH said, in answer to the appeal of the hon. Gentleman, that in his opinion if this Amendment were carried, it would greatly restrict the scope of the Bill and exclude a large number of persons from its operation.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 82; Noes, 316. (Division List, No. 175.)

AYES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
BalfourRt. Hn.A.J.(City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hill, Sir Clement
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Joynson-Hicks, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Winterton, Earl
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. M'Arthur and Mr. Harmood-Banner.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J.H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, RtHn SirJ.T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert

Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt Hn Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. L. (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, John (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kean, John
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim, N
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N, (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central
Price, Sir Robert J. (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sloan, Thomas Henry

Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland J. E.
Tayor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason,Rt.Hn.E (Clackmannan
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he moved the Second Amendment standing in his name. He had put down two because he was not quite certain as to what would happen last night. The Committee having approved the schedule, he begged to move the Second Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 26, at end, to insert the words '(3) The means of the person as calculated under this Act must not exceed £31 10s.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill,"—put, and agreed to.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) moved an Amendment providing that a person shall be disqualified for receiving an old-age pension while he is in receipt of any poor relief (other than relief excepted under this provision) until "the 31st day of December, 1910, unless" Parliament otherwise determines if he has at any time since Januray 1st, 1908, received any such relief. He understood that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was willing to accept the Amendment. The result of accepting the Amendment was that they would be giving a statutory undertaking which would appear in the Bill itself that no pauper should be excluded from the benefit of the Old-Age Pensions Act later than 31st December, 1910. They also had the further Parliamentary undertaking which had been given by the right hon. Gentleman during the Committee stage. The Amendment was really only the fulfilment of the distinct pledges given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Committee stage. Personally, and he believed he spoke for many others, they were sincerely grateful to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for meeting them in the way in which he had. They recognised that under the circumstances, having regard to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman had not yet received the Report of the Poor Law Commission, he had done everything that he possibly could. He would detain the House no longer but formally move.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 5, after the word 'until' to insert the words 'the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and ten, unless.'"—(*Mr. Soares.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE accepted the Amendment.

SIR F. BANBURY said before the Amendment was accepted by the House he would like to ask whether an Amendment which would admit all these paupers and greatly increase the cost of the measure was in order. His second point was that he did not approve of the date being put in in this way, because it might make it necessary to deal with the matter under the Expiring Laws

Continuance Bill. He would have preferred that the old phrase should have been allowed to remain. The only reason that the Chancellor of the Exchequer could have to accept this Amendment was his desire to put off the evil day. If the Amendment was carried a large increase in the pensions must occur at a considerable cost to the Exchequer. He did not think that was good legislation. No one knew how they were going to meet the liabilities which would fall due after next March, and if there was to be a large increase of liability accruing in 1911 the Parliament of that day should be left to deal with it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, who only the other day preached the necessity of economy, had now accepted an Amendment which would increase the cost enormously. The expenditure the right hon. Gentleman was responsible for he desired to restrict, but expenditure which would occur three years hence he cared nothing about. They were now legislating for 1911, two and a half years hence, and they did not know what might happen then. They did not know in the least how great the deficit, owing to falling revenue, would be. Under these circumstances, it was extremely rash of the Government to accept the Amendment. If it was passed, and the Government said in 1911 that they had not the money to do it, they would have to have a new amending Act. The House ought to pause, therefore, before accepting the Amendment.

MR. WALTER LONG thought this Amendment certainly deserved more consideration than it had received. It was the first occasion on which such an Amendment in this form had ever been accepted. The Government had often, for the purpose of achieving the object they had in view, limited an Act for a certain time, with the result that when the time came the difficulty could always be got out of by putting the Act into the schedule of the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. It seemed to him that if the Amendment were inserted the hon. Member would be able to claim that he was the only private Member who had succeeded in getting an Amendment inserted which added materially to the expenses of the Bill; whereas with all others they had been told that they could not add to the cost of the Bill, and that it could only be done by the Government, and not left to a private Member. Further than that, they had been told that they could not deal with anything that added to the cost of the Bill, unless it were dealt with in Committee. What was to be the proposal of the Government? If this was to be their procedure it would form a precedent. What was it that the Government were doing? They had been thanked by hon. Gentlemen for their generosity; but it seemed to those on his side of the House that they were being generous with other people's time as well as other people's money. Here were the Government entering into an obligation to do a certain thing at the distant period of eighteen months from now. Many things might happen in eighteen months; but suppose when the time came that the business of the country was in the same condition as it was in to-day, and when they had got through a portion of their work they were obliged to sit in the autumn, what were the Government going to do? Were they going to bring in an amending Bill simply altering this, or were they going to postpone it to another year? Were they going, when 1910 came, again to legislate and make it 1911, for which purpose they must have a separate Bill, to go through all its stages, to postpone the date? The proper course for the Government, if the proposals in the Bill were of an experimental kind and not permanent, was to give Parliament an opportunity of reconsidering whether the proper course would not be to follow precedent and have a fixed limit—say one or two years, or whatever they liked. The present course was entirely against precedent, and had nothing to recommend it except for the purpose of the Government's shunting its responsibility probably on to the shoulders of their successors. The year 1910 for the purposes of legislation practically meant two and a half years from the present year. It meant that the House was pledging Parliament to legislate in two and a half years from now. That was an extraordinary step for any Government to take, and he could not understand why the Government had not adopted the simpler procedure, for which there were many precedents, of passing legislation limiting the time to two years for the operation of the Act. Then at the end of two years they would have the right to introduce fresh legislation, or they would have the right to put the Act into the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. That would impose no liability on the Government's successors, would expose Parliament to no inconvenience, and was the orthodox and recognised practice. He protested against this new procedure, adopted as it was at the instance of a private Member, whose very few remarks were devoted entirely to showing that he thanked the Government for the great favour that they were giving to their followers.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR on the point of order asked whether an Amendment which seemed definitely to increase the cost of the Bill could be moved on the Report stage.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said he thought that the right hon. Gentleman had risen to make some observations. The Amendment had been moved to carry out a pledge given by the Government in Committee. The point which he wished particularly to put was this: It was simply an Amendment which specifically pledged this Parliament to deal with the problem of the Poor Law disqualification before 31st December, 1910, the words being "until Parliament otherwise determines." He submitted that these were simply words of interpretation. The words "31st of December, 1910," were simply the interpretation given by the House to the words, "until Parliament otherwise determines." It was a specific mandate to the House to deal with the matter before 31st December, 1910. That was the sense in which the Government had accepted it; that was the sense in which the Government had interpreted it in Committee, and not as adding anything to the cost of the scheme. On the contrary, they thought that it should be considered by Parliament when the problem came to be dealt with later on. It had not been suggested in the course of the discussion in Committee, nor was it suggested now, that the whole cost should fall on the Exchequer. It was the Poor Law matter merely that was now under consideration, and it was suggested that Parliament should deal with it before 31st December, 1910, as the interpretation of the words "until Parliament otherwise determines."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked whether it was competent for the House to bind either itself or any future House of Commons, to legislate before a given date, and, if the House did not legislate before 1910, would not the result inevitably be a great increase of the public charge?

*MR. SPEAKER: By the words "until Parliament otherwise determines" it may be said that the House has already committed itself to the expenditure, and this Amendment will only make certain what was previously left indefinite.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that, as he understood Mr. Speaker's ruling, it was that if Parliament was going to deal with the matter before the end of that year it might not increase the charge. If Parliament did not do that, the charge would be increased. Until that was done, it might go on for an indefinite period but for those words. The Bill was framed on an economic basis which, under this Amendment, would stop sharp at the end of 1910, and then thereafter, unless Parliament legislated —it had not anything to compel it to legislate—the charge would be very much increased. That seemed to him to be very near the line.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have nothing further to add to what I have said. Does the right hon. Gentleman desire to address the House on the Amendment?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that, if the right hon. Gentleman would permit him, there were one or two questions which he would first desire to answer. He thought the complaint was made that this was not the usual form; that they were not following precedent in inserting this provisional clause merely as a sub-clause of one clause of the Bill, and that what they really ought to do was to follow precedent by making the Bill provisional in its character as to time. The reason of the Government was that they did not desire to make the Bill provisional in its character. They wanted the Bill as a whole to be a permanent charge on the revenue of the country. But with regard to this provision as to the Poor Law, they intended that it should be temporary; they intended that it should be limited to the two years which they now sought to put into the Bill. That was the real reason why they were dealing with the temporary character of the Bill—the only part of it which was provisional.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would inform the House what would be the cost, according to the actuarial experts, in which they would be involved. They had heard last night from the right hon. Gentleman, in regard to a large number of propositions, some sort of explanation as to how much money each might involve. The question now under discussion was obviously a most important one, and would have the effect of bringing into the purview of old-age pensions an immense body of people, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman or some other member of the Government could tell them what this would mean in figures. He had no doubt after what the right hon. Gentleman had told them last night that he had had a special study made of the different Amendments in order to ascertain from the best actuarial expert opinion that could be brought to bear upon the subject what the proposal would mean to the Exchequer at the present moment; and he for one would very much like to know what would be the cost of an Amendment of this character and to what the country would really be committed. It was a very important point, and they were entitled to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer for those figures, because, although on every one of the Amendments they had been told that they could do nothing to increase the cost of the Bill, yet when this important matter came under discussion they were told that the Amendment would be accepted.

LORD R. CECIL said he wanted to put the problem, as he understood it, in a precise form. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that if this disqualification were struck out of the Bill it would mean an addition of £3,500,000 to the annual cost of the scheme. But it had been pointed out that if it were left permanent it would go on diminishing; the difference between the cost of the scheme without it, and the cost of the scheme with it, would go on diminishing, because the guardians would gradually cease to give outdoor relief, and all the people who would otherwise receive outdoor relief would gradually become pensioners. The point raised by his hon. friend was this: How many outdoor relief people would have become pensioners in the estimation of the Government before 31st December, 1910? That, of course, must be taken from the £3,500,000. But supposing that something or other happened and nothing further was done, that the Bill was left to work itself out as it stood, and that this disqualification came to an end altogether on 31st December, 1910, what would be the net addition to the cost of the scheme to the country? He did not know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer could tell them that, but it was information which they would like to have.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the Question put to him by the hon. Member for Liverpool was what, in fact, would be the additional charge. As a matter of fact, in his judgment this would diminish the charge for the very reason pointed out by the noble Lord, because Parliament would be face to face with the problem of the Poor Law with a view to discrimination, and also with a view to allocating the charge between local and Imperial finance. He was afraid he could not answer the noble Lord off-hand, but he would look into the matter and give him the answer. It involved very careful inquiry into figures.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought the whole procedure on which the Government had embarked in this connection was very astounding. Just let them consider how they stood in connection with the allied problems of reform of the Poor Law and of the old-age pension scheme. The Government did not in the least know what suggestions were going to be made by the Royal Commission nor where they were going to find the money for old-age pensions. With these two ignorances oppressing them, they mortgaged their future assets in point of money without in the least knowing what they were, and they were mortgaging the time of the House without in the least knowing what the time of the House was. Had the Government shown themselves, either in the matter of money or time, such excellent managers of their resources, so provident, so far-seenig, so capable of forecasting the real obligations which would fall on them as they gradually matured, that they should trust them in this matter? They were aking the House to sit about nine or ten months this year. They had all these enormous financial problems to deal with next year, and in the year after they had to consider the Report of the Commission, which had not yet been presented, which certainly would not be unanimous, and which would deal with one of the most complicated social problems ever considered by any Commission. This Government, who certainly did not give themselves much leisure for thought or reflection, actually told them that under the penalty of having the taxpayer charged with £3,500,000 more than the existing charge of their pension scheme, they or their successors were to find the solution of the great problem of Poor Law reform before 31st December, 1910. He thought it was the most flagitious way of dealing with future obligations, whether of time or money of which they had any record in Parliamentary experience. In his opinion the precise date which the right hon. Gentleman had substituted for the vague Parliamentary phrase which occurred in the original Bill aggravated rather than diminished the evil which they had to fear, and he should certainly vote against him.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 292; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 76.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Alden, Percy
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,RtHn SirJ.T.(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H.(St.Pancras,N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan,C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.

Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn SirW.Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Francis E. (Leitrim,N.)
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H,
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th)
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H.(Denbighs)
Robertson,Sir G Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley,Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne,G. R. (Wolverhampton)
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker,Rt.Hn SirThomasP.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham,Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Ashley, W. W.
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clive, Percy Archer
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hills, J. W.
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Joynson-Hicks, William
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Rt.Hn. Walter (Dublin, S
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Morpeth, Viscount
Parkes, Ebenezer
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

Other Amendments made—

"In page 2, line 18, to leave out the word 'such.'"

"In page 2, line 18, to leave out the word 'as,' and insert the words '(other than medical or surgical assistance or relief hereinbefore specifically excepted) which.'"

"In page 2, line 18, after the word 'is,' to insert the words 'expressly declared.'"

"In page 2, line 18, after the word 'not,' to insert the words 'to be.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 19, at the end, to insert the words 'or a reason for depriving any person of any franchise, right, or privilege.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he was not quite certain as to the effect of this Amendment. His attention had been called to a case in which certain people who occupied almshouses had been disqualified from voting, and he presumed the reason was that they did not get the proper latchkey control.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that these words were necessary because some of the Vaccination Acts did not expressly refer to this disqualification.

LORD R. CECIL said that according to his reading of the subsection its effect was to make anything that was now a disqualification a bar to a pension. Would that also apply to future legislation? Supposing a Bill was brought in which removed some disqualification for some particular form of Poor Law relief, for example, by providing that henceforth the treatment of a patient in an infirmary should not disqualify him for voting. Would that, *ipso facto*, give that man a right to a pension? If so, it would be a Bill imposing a charge upon the taxpayer and no such Bill could be introduced without a preliminary Resolution in Committee. That would put it out of the power of any private Member to deal with the question. He would like to know from the Attorney-General what was the object of this subsection.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said the point raised by the noble Lord depended entirely upon the wording to which he had referred, and the form in which it was passed. As to his point of order he was not able to express an opinion upon it. *Ipso facto* if a Bill of the sort indicated were passed the disqualifications dealt with would cease.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that according to the right hon. Gentleman's statement the effect of some future law removing Poor Law disqualifications might be at one blow to alter the class of people who were entitled to receive a pension. He thought they were entitled to know there and then what those disqualifications were going to be. If it was made clear that what was meant was the present disqualifications attaching to pauperism there would be an end of the question; but if the question was left open as the Chancellor of the Exchequer indicated, and could be altered by any subsequent Registration Law, it was likely to be in a muddle, and very serious difficulties and complications with regard to other subjects would arise. That was a most objectionable way of dealing with the subject.

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) said there was a Bill brought in by the hon. Member for Somerset which took away the disqualification for some forms of Poor Law relief such as medical relief. In future any party dealing with disqualifications for the franchise would at the same time be altering legislation in a different field of life, and they would be fundamentally altering the foundation upon which this Bill was based. That seemed a very undesirable way of proceeding; it was very unscientific and cumbersome, and it might be the means of permitting by a side wind a very large number of new pensioners to come under the scheme, which would vastly increase the cost. All through the debates the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been adamant as regarded any proposals to increase the cost of the scheme, and he had begged the House not to press him as he had no money with which to deal with the suggestions made. Notwithstanding that, the right hon. Gentleman was quite reckless in accepting obligations which would mature in three years time, and he had made no attempt to maintain that strict guardianship of the finances of the country in future years which he so steadfastly maintained for the present year. He thought the subsection ought to be recast in order that all the bars to pensions might be clearly understood by all citizens.

MR. BOWLES thought everybody would agree that there was some force in the remarks made by his hon. friends on this point. The object they had in view was to make the disqualification clear and final, and that could be achieved if the Government would put in some words confining their measure to those matters which were at the present moment a disqualification. Surely they could not allow the Bill when it became an Act to shift about automatically with every change in the franchise.

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said the Amendments standing in the name of the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil and the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London were not in order.

SIR F. BANBURY, on a point of order, said his Amendment added the words "by reason of gambling, drunkenness, or idleness." He respectfully submitted that those words were in order.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said it would considerably narrow the area of disqualification, and, therefore, decrease the charge on the revenue.

LORD R. CECIL, speaking on the point of order, said it was a great surprise to many Members of the House to hear from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that his test would exclude more people than would be excluded by the Amendment proposed by his hon. friend. That was a matter of very grave doubt, and he submitted with the greatest respect that it was not one which it was possible for any occupant of the Chair to pronounce upon. The words which provided that it was to be a disqualification for a pension if an applicant "has habitually failed to work according to his ability, opportunity, and need . . . ." were so vague that it was difficult to say what they meant. He submitted that they would be construed to exclude only those who were, in the words of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, wastrels and drunkards. If the Amendment were accepted, not only would wastrels and drunkards be excluded, but also those whose failure could be shown to be due to gambling or idleness.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have conferred with Mr. Speaker particularly on this point. On the question of substance, I do think that the hon. Baronet's Amendment would narrow the exceptions.

SIR F. BANBURY asked if he might move the Amendment in another way. He would move to insert after the second "he" in line 21 the words "shall have brought himself into a position to apply for a pension by reason of gambling, drunkenness, idleness, or."

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think that would extend the exceptions, and, therefore, it would be in order.

Sir F. BANBURY said he would move the Amendment in that form. It would pass the wit of man to define the words in the Bill "ability, opportunity, and need," and, therefore, some words should be introduced which the ordinary pension committee or pension officer would be able to understand. The words of the Amendment were extremely clear. There were a large number of people who worked for some hours of the day at crossing sweeping and other casual occupations and earned enough to keep themselves in a very comfortable way. He was told by the chairman of a London board of guardians that there were many people who earned their living by doing odd jobs for small payments, and who never had what might be called regular work. These people did not dislike hard work, but they disliked regular work, prefering to take the chance of earning 1s. or 2s. casually now and again. So far as he could make out that class would under this clause be qualified for pensions, because all they would have to say was that they had worked so far as was necessary for their need. Who was going to define what was meant by working according to opportunity? He had come across a great many people who always attributed their misfortune to want of opportunity; it was never caused by stupidity, laziness, or anything inherent in themselves. [Cries of "Oh."] He was not speaking specially of the working classes. That applied to all classes. The people he had in his mind were more or less the professional classes. Hon. Members misjudged him if they thought he was in the least prejudiced. He had gained some experience of the world, and he would devote himself to the best of his ability to see that Acts of Parliament were framed in accordance with human nature as it was, and not in accordance with human nature as it appeared to be in the generous hearts of hon. Members. The word "ability" would be equally difficult to define, for there were some who, though they had the ability, preferred the easier part of not exerting themselves according to their ability. The clause as it stood was almost incapable of interpretation, and it would be interpreted in all sorts of different ways by pension committees and pension officers. The words he proposed to introduce were simple and would have the effect of governing the loose phraseology of the Bill. He begged to move.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 21, after the second word 'he,' to insert the words 'shall have brought himself into a position to apply for a pension by reason of gambling, drunkenness, idleness, or.'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich) said the hon. Baronet made a useful observation which would be very helpful to the House. He said that to find a proper form of words would pass the wit of man.

Sir F. BANBURY said that what he stated was that, to interpret the form of words in the clause as proposed by the Government would pass the wit of man.

Mr. CROOKS said that was exactly what he was going to apply to the Amendment of the hon. Baronet. It would pass the wit of any ordinary man to give a definition of those three words—"gambling, drunkenness, and idleness." It would be possible to argue for a week, or, for that part, for any length of time as to what was gambling. He had heard it described as a man putting a shilling on the wrong horse and losing his money. There were people who declared that such a man was a supporter of the glorious national sport of horse-racing. That was one form of gambling. Then, he had heard in that House discussions on company promoters, and those who watered stock and the capital of companies. He had also heard talk of South African mines, and the necessity of putting Chinese labour into them in order to get the shareholders' money back. He did not know whether that was gambling or not; it might be open to discussion. It might be regarded as the spirit of initiative for which the Britisher was so notable, and, in that event, the man was an investor; but if he was "blued" in his investment he would lose his pension, and if he backed the wrong horse he was bowled out at once. Next as to drunkenness; was there any living soul who could define drunkenness? He had seen a barometer marking degrees of drunkenness—half-slewed, half-drunk, steadily drunk, talkatively drunk, quarrelsome drunk, maudlin drunk, dead drunk, besides other sorts of drunkenness. What particular degree of drunkenness was to disqualify for a pension? He had even been in another place, and had seen a noble Lord trying to balance a glass of water. He did not think it was the water that over-balanced his legs. What about the noble Lords who had gambled away the whole of their estates? He had seen men walk into this House and it was difficult to say that they were drunk, but still more difficult to say that they were perfectly sober. Were they going to put the poor pension committee in the position of inquiring how a man had lost his money if he ever had any? But when he came to idleness, that capped the whole lot. Would they define the British House of Commons listening to the hon. Baronet hour after hour as indulging in idleness? No one could define idleness. It all depended upon the class one belonged to. The ordinary intelligent legislator "cultivated leisure"; the poor unfortunate members below the gangway "wasted time" in discussing questions they had not properly devoted attention to! The House might go on debating these three words, "gambling, drunkenness and idleness" until hon. Members were seventy, and then, though qualified by age for pensions, they would be disqualified on account of so many years waste of time and idleness. Who then would be qualified? It was useless to discuss what the scheme would cost, because everyone would be disqualified, and so the scheme would cost nothing at all. The hon. Baronet had said something about the man who did odd jobs. He thought the hon. Baronet said "messing about"; that was language up to his standard! He was reminded of the man who, on being asked by his employer what he had been doing, presented a bill:—"To whitewashing, stopping up rat holes, and humbugging about, 4s. 6d." Under the hon. Baronet's scheme that man would be ruled out. He had no two opinions about the Amendment; and he would vote against it at once.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr, SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that the hon. Member who had just spoken had demonstrated how impossible it would be to carry out the hon. Baronet's Amendment. The only definition of drunkenness that he had ever heard was made by a man who was asked if he had ever seen anybody drunk; and his reply was "Oh, he did not think he had; but he had seen a commercial traveller wheeled along a railway platform in a wheelbarrow, and he really thought that he was a little overcome." As to a question of character as a test, that had been abandoned in deference to the general opinion expressed on both sides of the House that the test ought to be rather that of industry. That was the Amendment which the Government had now introduced into the Bill. The hon. Baronet proposed to revert to the character test, which discussion had shown would be not only impossible but inexpedient. The words of the Bill as they now stood would cover the cases referred to by the hon. Baronet, viz., the cases of those who were habitual gamblers, drunkards, and idlers.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he wished the opponents of the Amendment would come to some agreement among themselves as to what the effect of it would really be. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had been upheld by the Deputy Speaker in the view, when the Amendment was proposed in another form, that it would lead to an increase of charge, and now it was held that it would diminish pensions. He had listened with some regret to the references made by the hon. Member for

Woolwich to this House and to another place, and he still further regretted that these charges should have been received as a matter of laughter. The hon. Member for Woolwich, in opposing the Amendment, had asked if they set up a test, and said that a man should be disqualified for receiving a pension who had brought himself into a position of need by gambling, drunkenness, and idleness, who was to get a pension? But who was to get a pension under the Government scheme? He admitted the difficulty of determining who had brought himself into a position of need by gambling, drunkenness, or idleness. The Government believed that by their Amendment they would exclude any man who had wasted his life by gambling, drunkenness, and idleness. They also believed that they had done something more; but he did not think that the Government had found a definition which was easier of interpretation than that of the hon. Baronet. That was the question he wanted answered by the Postmaster-General, and he thought the House was entitled to an answer before the vote was taken.

MR. KEIR HARDIE said the objection to the Amendment was obvious. The Postmaster-General had stated quite clearly that the Government had agreed to delete the character test, and the Amendment proposed to reinsert it. The Government proposed only an industry test, the Amendment suggested there should be also a moral one. He hoped the House would reject the Amendment and pass to the discussion of other Amendments of importance.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD expressed the hope that the Government would accept the Amendment. The object of it was not to cast any slur on the words proposed by the Government, but to add certain other disqualifications. It was only right to make it quite clear that as these pensions were to be a reward for elderly people of a deserving character, the drunkard, the gambler, and the idle person should be excluded. Although it might be difficult to define the words gambler and drunkard, it would not be difficult if a man had been convicted three or four times in three or four consecutive years for drunkenness to say that the man was a drunkard and ought not to have a pension. There was far greater difficulty in defining what the ability of a man of seventy was. It might be easy to do so in the rural districts, but in large cities such as Liverpool and London where work was not given to men over forty-five years of age there were many hundreds of deserving people who were unable to find work. How was it possible to say that those men had failed to work according to their ability, opportunity, and needs? It would be a very easy thing for a pension officer to say to a man: "You have not worked according to your ability, opportunity and needs, because I myself have seen you knocking about for the last ten or fifteen years doing nothing." The clause, if passed, would be a most unsatisfactory and difficult clause to deal with; it provided no reasonable safeguards against the wrong kind of men getting pensions, and the idea of the Amendment was to make it possible for the habitual drunkard, gambler, or idler to be kept out. He would support the Amendment.

MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton) said that while the hon. Member who spoke last was nominally supporting the Amendment, his speech was a criticism of the clause which the Amendment was to alter. If there were difficulties of construction in the clause those difficulties would be increased by the Amendment, which would lead to great injustice in many cases. The word "habitually" did not apply in any reasonable interpretation of the clause. He was surprised that the hon. Member should seek to support an Amendment which would bring into consideration matters which could not properly be decided by any tribunal or committee established under the Bill and which would work inequitably and unjustly throughout the country. On these grounds he opposed the Amendment.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) said he could not support the Amendment of the hon. Baronet. It only carried the absurdity of the clause a little further. There were only two ways of carrying out a pension scheme: it should be either contributory or universal. In either case these difficulties would have been avoided. He was amazed at the attitude of the Postmaster-General when he said the Government were abandoning the character test.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I said it was an industry test.

MR. BRIDGEMAN said the right hon. Gentleman called it an industry test. The right hon. Gentleman agreed to an industry test, but he made one reservation in the case of what he called the wastrel. He himself would like to know what a wastrel was. What was the meaning of subsection (*b*), which referred to refusal to work, if it was not a character test? Surely, if it was an industry test to exclude wastrels, it was an industry test to exclude a person who had brought himself into a position to apply for a pension by reason of gambling, drunkenness, and idleness. It was really absurd for the Postmaster-General to tell them there was any difference in principle between the two. The Amendment would make the Bill more ridiculous than it was, and for that reason he thanked his hon. friend for having moved it.

*MR. VERNEY thought the Postmaster-General was perfectly justified. The whole system of pensions was based on wealth which was the direct result of industry. An immoral man who by industry contributed to that wealth had a right to a pension. But, in the absence of industry, there could be no right to a pension at all.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Central) hoped his hon. friend would not press the Amendment. He sympathised with his object to clear up the definition in the Bill, which he was sure would lead to untold difficulties, but he was afraid his words did not do it. Under the Amendment it would not only be necessary to prove a man had been a gambler, an idler, or a drunkard, but that his gambling, idleness, or drunkenness had placed him in a position to need a pension. They might prove the one, but how would they prove the other? A man might admit he had put a shilling on, had no doubt taken too much at times, and had not worked as hard as he might, and yet say that his present condition was not owing to these little peccadilloes but to other matters, such, for instance, as foreign competition or hostile tariffs. A pension committee, unconsciously impregnated with these views, might accept his excuses. He was afraid the Amendment was not practicable, and, though he had the heartiest sympathy with his hon. friend's object, he could not support him and would be bound to vote against the Amendment.

Amendment negatived.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON moved to insert in Clause 3, after the word "maintenance," the words "or benefit." It had, he said, been thought by some Members that the subsection would only apply to men, because it might be difficult for a woman to show that she had worked according to her ability, opportunity, and need for the maintenance of herself and those legally dependent upon her; and they proposed to insert the words "or benefit" in order to make it clear the subsection applied to women as well as to men.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 23, after the word 'maintenance,' to insert the words 'or benefit.'"—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he was in entire sympathy with the Amendment and he had only one observation to make. The Bill either included married women who had kept house respectably and well, but who technically it might be said had not worked for the maintenance of themselves or those dependent upon them, in which case the words proposed were unnecessary; or it did not, in which case the Amendment would place a new charge upon the Exchequer and therefore fell within the category of those which they had not been allowed to move. He did not know on which of these horns of dilemma the right hon. Gentleman desired to sit.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he did not desire to sit on either. The Government had carefully considered the question, and they had been advised that the words in the Bill would cover the case of women. Certain Members doubted that. They were anxious to make it absolutely clear, and they therefore proposed these words. They would not impose any additional charge, because in the opinion of the Government the case of women was already covered.

MR. KEIR HARDIE said that, so far as wives were concerned, the words were not necessary, because provision was made for them in a second paragraph of the clause, but the object of the Amendment which he had put down was to meet the case of a woman who was not a wife but who was either a widow or a spinster. They might possibly have been excluded, and he was therefore very glad the Government preferred to insert the words.

MR. BOWLES said he had an Amendment to deal with this very point. It appeared to him that whilst the Amendment of the Postmaster-General would no doubt provide for the case of married women, it was not certain that it would do so for the single woman, who possibly had no person legally dependent upon her. He preferred the plain and straightforward statement of his own Amendment to the very intricate Amendment the Government proposed. It did not seem at all certain that it would include all women.

LORD R. CECIL said they had not had an opportunity of considering the words, but he confessed they appeared to him to make it very doubtful what would be the ultimate meaning of the clause. All work was practically done for the maintenance or benefit either of the man himself or those legally dependent upon him, and he wanted to ask the Government what was the force of the words, "maintenance or benefit of himself or those legally dependent upon him." He ventured to submit that the addition of the words "or benefit" would enormously extend the scope of the clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the noble Lord puts that to me as a point of order, I have to say that the Postmaster-General, in reply to a question, stated that the charge would not be increased, and I shall treat the Amendment as an explanation, just as I have decided to treat the Amendment of the hon. Member for Norwood which follows. It is extremely difficult, as hon. Members will see, to draw the line sometimes.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. BOWLES said he desired to move the Amendment which stood in his name, because it appeared to be extremely doubtful whether the words, as amended, included every woman whom it was desired to include. There were very few working women of whom it could be said that they had worked according to their ability, opportunity and need for the maintenance of themselves and those legally dependent upon them. What was wanted was not some mere indirect allusion such as the Postmaster-General had put in, but a plain and simple statement such as he now proposed. To leave it to the pension officer to judge whether or not she had worked for other people's benefit was very vague, and it was not the right way to deal with it. The Government Amendment gave great scope to doubts of interpretation of many kinds. He hoped the Government would either assure them that the case of every woman who ought to be included was included in the words as they stood or accept the Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL seconded the Amendment. He did not understand that the words of the Government would include the case which they all wanted to include, namely, that of the woman who was keeping house. It was pretty clear that she did not work for the maintenance of herself if she kept house for her husband.

AN HON. MEMBER: You ask my wife.

LORD R. CECIL said he did not think the wives of hon. Members were the best judges of the construction of the clause. He did not think the words were at all clear, but the words of the Amendment were perfectly clear, and the Government, he suggested, would do well to accept it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 24, at end, to insert the words 'Provided that a woman shall be deemed to have worked for the maintenance of herself and her dependants if she has kept house for others.'"—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON had no hesitation in saying that every case that had been mentioned by the mover and seconder of the Amendment was absolutely covered by the Bill as it stood. The Amendment, however, appeared very much to limit the number of those who would benefit under the Bill. It limited them to those who had kept house for others, and not even kept house for themselves, and the Government could not possibly accept the words as they stood.

MR. BOWLES said that if the Government were sure these cases were covered, he did not think he ought to put the House to the trouble of a division.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD R. CECIL moved to omit the words "up to" and insert "any time before" in the proviso removing the disqualification in the case of ten years continuous membership of a trade union or benefit society. He wanted to know whether by "up to" they meant from fifty to sixty or any time before reaching the age of sixty. It was a matter of great importance, because if it meant from fifty to sixty he would have thought that that would exclude a very large number of people whom it would be rather hard to exclude because they had failed for one term to pay their subscriptions after the age of fifty. That was probably the most difficult period for a working man to keep up his payments to a society. Whichever the Government meant, they ought to make it quite clear. He had put down two alternative Amendments. One was to insert "any time before" and the other to insert "immediately before." He did not think it was of very great importance which was intended, though there were great difficulties attaching to both, but whichever was intended it should be made quite clear.

MR. BARNES said he would do himself the pleasure of seconding the noble Lord's Amendment, and he was very glad to find himself in agreement with him for once. This seemed to have a widening effect on the Bill, and he was glad the point was raised, because he could conceive conditions under which it would be a very great hardship for a man between fifty and sixty to keep up his payments. That was the most difficult period to get through. In the industrial world a man often found it difficult even before fifty and very hard after that to get work, and he would say there were many cases which would be excluded under the operation of the Bill as it stood. He knew the point had been made before. It might be said that members of friendly societies and trade unions were members of those societies at an early age and had to stick to them. But that did not apply all round. There were members of such trade unions, for instance, as that with which the hon. Member for West Ham was connected, where members were constantly going in and out again.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said that having heard from the speeches of the mover and seconder what they were desiring to do, it seemed that it must inevitably increase the charge.

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked whether this was not an interpretation Amendment similar to the two which had been allowed to pass previously.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I should like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer what his interpretation of the Amendment is.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that he had proposed to raise the point of order. It was clear that the paragraph could only mean the ten years immediately before the age of sixty. He would not have thought that there was the slightest doubt about that. If any ten years were to be taken, a man might have been a member of a friendly society or trade union at any time of his life, and that would add considerably to the number of those who would come on the pensions.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said the Amendment clearly enhanced the charge, and that was out of order.

LORD R. CECIL moved to leave out "up to" and insert "immediately before." Let them at any rate know what they were doing. The Labour Members would hope the Bill did not mean what the Government said it did, and he could understand that they would be against the Amendment, but the Government would be only too glad to accept it because it would make it perfectly plain. "Immediately before attaining the age of sixty" was far clearer and more definite than the Government's words. Let them not use a phrase which might be construed by one committee in one way and by another committee in another. Let them say exactly what they meant and they would know what benefit they were conferring on the working class and what they were not.

SIR F. BANBURY seconded the Amendment, as he understood that it only effected what the Government desired.

Amendment proposed to the Bill—

"In page 2, line 26, to leave out the words 'up to,' and insert the words 'immediately before,'"—(*Lord R. Cecil,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'up to' stand part of the Bill."

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken him by surprise. The language of the provision had not given the impression which the right hon. Gentleman now placed upon it. Had the word "the" been inserted before the words "ten years" the section might have been understood in the sense in which the right hon. Gentleman interpreted it. The impression of the Labour Party had been that what was required was membership of a trade union or friendly society for any ten years of a man's life before he reached the age of sixty years. They were seriously concerned about the construction which the right hon. Gentleman had put upon the provision. In his own trade union there were 150,000 operatives in the cotton trade, not one of whom had a vested interest in a pension. It was a common thing for those people to cease work at fifty or fifty-five years of age, and, according to what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, the Bill would be of no use to them. That was something which the Labour Members had never contemplated, and it appeared now, by the ruling from the Chair, that the provision could not be altered; but he hoped that another opportunity would be found to alter it, and that the Government would not acept the Amendment moved by the noble Lord.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE replied that he would not have thought there was the slightest doubt about the meaning of the clause. The Government chose the words in order to make it clear to everybody that they meant the ten years before the age of sixty was reached. That was done for a very good reason. A man might join a friendly society or trade union at the age of twenty years, remain a member for ten years, and then become a wastrel and a loafer through the remainder of his life. If he could claim a pension, that would not make the clause a test of industry and thrift. But if from his fiftieth to his sixtieth year a man worked and was a member of a friendly society or trade union, that was a real test, and if his hon. friend looked at any Colonial or foreign scheme of old-age pensions he would find that that period of life was the real testing time. In the most favourable scheme—the Colonial—the test of industry and character went up to sixty-five years of age. The Government had taken the age of sixty. He had interviewed representatives of friendly societies, and put this point to them, and they were certainly in favour of a test up to sixty years of age.

LORD R. CECIL: Did the right hon. Gentleman put this test to the friendly societies?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that he did, and they preferred it, because they did not wish a man merely to join a society in a fit of enthusiasm and leave it after a few years, but to continue his membership. He put to them the case of a man whose health broke down when he was fifty years old, and he became unable to keep up his subscriptions, and they answered that they regarded such a man as a member as long as he was receiving benefit from the society, and that his subscriptions were paid by the society for him. The question was purely one of drafting. They could not go back on the decision of the Committee. If there was to be any test of thrift and industry at all, it was certainly better to have it immediately before a man reached the age at which he might be entitled to a pension. The words suggested by the noble Lord were the alternative words considered by the Government, and their advisors were strongly of opinion that those they had decided upon were better, and made the matter clearer. After a good deal of careful consideration the Government decided on these words.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN concurred in thinking that these words, naturally interpreted, meant the last ten years preceding the age of sixty. No doubt it was annoying and vexatious to hon. Gentlemen below the gangway to find out at the last moment, when neither they nor anyone else had the opportunity of moving an alternative, what was the intention of the Government, and what was the effect of the Bill they were passing. Once again those hon. Gentlemen had an illustration of the result of the cheerful vote they gave for the guillotine, and the engineer found himself hoist with his own petard. On the general merits of the case he was with the Chancellor of the Exchequer as against hon. Gentlemen below the gangway. At the same time he thought there would be some very hard cases under the test, and he hoped that even now the Government would consider what could be done to meet them. There was the case of the man in the rural district, often alluded to by his right hon. friend the Member for South Dublin, who joined one of the small clubs or friendly societies, many of which had come to grief. He might have contributed right up to the time the club failed, but if it failed when he was fifty-nine or fifty-eight, or at any time when he was between fifty and sixty, it was practically impossible for the man to qualify under this proviso. The proviso said—

> "If he continuously makes payment."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE replied that he was very glad that the right hon. Gentleman had again referred to this case. He thought it was a very strong case on its merits, and he was advised that under the words in the proviso, "or other approved steps made such provision," he had power to deal with it. He thought the case was one which ought to be recognised.

MR. GRETTON desired to give a word of warning in reference to the wholesale statement which had been made on this point, because he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer would, at some future time, find it very difficult to resist the claims which would be made.

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked the Attorney-General whether, according to the interpretation of the subsection, a pension committee or pension officer would be justified in holding that a person had not worked to the best of his ability if he had failed to maintain his contributions to one of the societies mentioned. That appeared to him to be a real danger. The pension committee might take that as a test whether a person had worked according to his ability, and if an applicant had not complied with that condition, he might be ruled out. If that was so, it constituted a very serious state of affairs indeed.

Sir W. ROBSON said that the hon. Member anticipated a danger that would not arise in the construction of the clause. The first part laid down the principle that if a man had "habitually failed to work according to his ability, opportunity, and need" he was disqualified. But in order that there might be an easy means of rebutting any allegation made against him the man was provided with a remedy if he could show that "he has continuously for ten years up to attaining the age of sixty" made his contributions in the way prescribed by the proviso. No question could arise, therefore, out of the antecedent part of the clause.

Lord R. CECIL asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The next Amendment on the Paper stood in the name of Lord Robert Cecil as follows—

"In Clause 3, page 2, line 29, after the word 'or,' to insert the words 'if at any time he has by.' "—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

*Mr. SPEAKER: This Amendment is not in order. It seems to me to whittle away the meaning of the word "continuously," and in that respect it would increase the charge.

Lord R. CECIL: May I ask your construction of the words "or other approved steps." I do not understand that to mean some other means of contributing to societies, but that a man has taken some other means of providing for old age. I think that, as a matter of clearness, it is desirable it should be stated in the clause that this need not be done over a period of ten years. It cannot be the meaning of the Government or of any sane person that you should not invest your money for ten years except in "friendly, provident, or other societies."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: According to the explanation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer it need not be a continuous contribution even to a friendly society. The right hon. Gentleman explained that he meant to include, or to leave himself open to include, cases in which a man had contributed for part of the ten years to societies which had subsequently become bankrupt.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The noble Lord must not ask me to construe the words of the Bill. As to the import of the word "continuously" I would say that it is applicable to the whole of that sentence, and, therefore, if the noble Lord seeks to whittle it away, he is really going back on the decision of the Committee and also widening the number of persons who will be admitted, and for that reason I do not think the noble Lord has a right to move it.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: With all respect, on the point of order may I point out that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has told us that the Government draftsman did not mean the word "continuously" to apply to all the methods by which approved steps for providing against old age, sickness, and infirmity, are dealt with. That is part of the explicit policy of the Government.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I take the Amendment on the Paper which proposes to insert the words "if at any time he has by." That certainly widens the clause, and it would increase the number who would come under the provision.

Mr. BOWLES moved to leave out the following words at the end of the proviso:

"And any such provision, when made by the husband in the case of a married couple living together, shall as respects any right of the wife to a pension, be treated as provision made by the wife as well as by the husband." He did not know whether the Government had considered this any more than the rest of the subsection, but it seemed to him to be an extraordinary provision. It would mean that a perfectly worthless woman whom nobody would desire to provide with a pension would be pensioned at the public expense. It could not be said that the pension in such a case was the reward of industry or of anything else. He could not understand how such a position could be justified. He supposed it had been put in, like a good deal of the rest of the Bill, in order to meet some case which had vaguely floated across the mind of the Government. The Government should say what they meant by a form of words which seemed to him to be perfectly ridiculous. He begged to move.

Lord R. CECIL seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 32, to leave out from the word 'Act' to end of page 2, line 36."—(*Mr. Bowles.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said that these words had received very careful consideration from the Government, and they intended to stand by them. If a man had been able to pay his subscriptions up to the age of sixty years, the wife ought to benefit from it. It was very often owing to the wife's care and good housewifery that the man had been able to save any money and pay his subscription to his friendly society, and she ought to have a fair share of the benefit of it. If the woman had been one who squandered her husband's means, he would not have been able to save anything at all.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment.

Mr. BOWLES said that, after the appeal which had been made to him by his hon. friend, he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord R. CECIL moved to insert the following proviso at the end of Subsection (c) in Clause 4: "Provided that such property shall not be deemed to be capable of investment, so as to bring in a larger return than at the rate of 2¾ per cent. per annum." He thought something should be done to say what kind of investment a man who had saved £100 was bound to make of that money. Was he to buy an annuity? Supposing a man did buy himself an annuity with his £100 at seventy years of age, that would represent a very considerable annuity and would reduce his pension considerably. But if he was bound to invest in Consols, his £100 would only bring in £2 15s. per annum. In that case, he would get a pension of an income subject to that deduction, and in addition to that he would be able to leave his £100 to his children, or his descendants. He thought that some such words as he proposed were needed in order to make it quite clear what was the nature of the investment the man was to make. He begged to move.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 3, line 32, after the word 'him' to insert the words, 'Provided that such property shall not be deemed capable of investment so as to bring in a larger return than at the rate of 2¾ per cent. per annum.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted"

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said he wished the noble Lord had put his Amendment down on the Paper so that they might have seen what the effect of it would be on the rest of the proviso. The noble Lord had taken only one kind of property. He had taken a sum of money yielding more than 2¾ per cent.; they might take some other kind of property which was not put to profitable use, and which ought to be put to profitable use. They must judge each case on its merits, and that was what the section did. It left it to the officer of the Government and to the pension committee to exercise their discretion in deciding in each particular case what use the property could be put to, and what return could be reasonably expected from it. It was all a matter of business, and he did not think they ought to prescribe the particular investment that ought to be made in each case.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR thought there was a bigger question behind this. A man might save throughout his life, and put his savings into a friendly society, insurance society, or some other society which paid him an annuity at a certain age, and paid him at a different rate of interest to a permanent investment because this investment would cease altogether with the man's life. Then there was the other case. Another man would invest exactly the same sum of money for the same number of years of his life, but he invested his money in some permanent funds like Government stock. During the short period of expectancy of life after seventy the man who had bought an annuity got large interest on his money, and it would seriously diminish the amount of his pension. But the second man, who had invested in a permanent security, got a smaller rate of interest, but he could leave the principal sum to his children, and the burden was thrown upon the taxpayer of paying the whole of his pension. The first man saved the taxpayers; the second man saved his principal. These were two quite different methods of dealing with exactly the same sum of money. The House ought to determine how the directions in this subsection were to be carried out by the committee. He hoped the Government would carefuly consider this question.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE said it was very difficult to go into all the ramifications of a proposal of this kind without a little more notice.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE thought the noble Lord had a case where a man might have saved £1,800, and yet he and his wife might be able to claim the whole of their pensions.

Lord R. CECIL: A sum of money in a stocking?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes. That was a case which ought to be excluded. The committee ought to have some discretion. The pension committee ought to be able to say what sum of money ought to produce more than enough to exclude. It would be absurd that a man who had £1,800 which he could leave to his children should be able to claim 10s. in pensions for his wife and himself.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: £1,800 invested in the funds?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, not invested at all. In a stocking. They would be able to claim a pension.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN thought the Government ought to be particularly careful if they discriminated that they did not discriminate against those who invested their savings with the Government itself. He had always regretted that in this country we had not that large number of small investors in Government funds which in France made so much for the stability of the French nation as well as French finance, and he thought that the Government ought to be very careful if they discriminated at all that they should not discriminate in such a way as to deter people from investing in Government funds.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had raised a very important question which ought to be debated. Let him take the case of a man to whom at the age of sixty-eight £400 was given as compensation for an accident. If that man invested it in Government funds it would bring in £10 a year. Was the pension officer to say that the money was not properly invested and that if instead of putting it in the funds its possessor had purchased an annuity it would have produced 4 per cent., and that therefore he was entitled to less pension?

And, it being half-past Ten of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 17th June, to put forthwith the Question upon the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

The House divided:—Ayes, 85; Noes, 363. (Division List No. 177.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitbread, Howard
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn. Sir J T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn

Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dewar,Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G.(Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn.SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt,Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie,J.Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J. M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Col. Sir Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W. Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A. Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.
MacVeigh, Chas.(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren,Sir C B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H.Rendall(Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan,Francis E.(Leitrim,N.)
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F.(Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare,N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps,Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E. (Edinburgh,Central)
Price,Sir Robert J. (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, William (Clare)

Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V.H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H (Ashton-under-Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T
Wason, Rt Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded successively to put forthwith the Question upon the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 12, after the word 'after,' to insert the words 'the day on which.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 372; Noes, 85. (Division List No. 178.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn Sir J T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William

Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T.(Renfrew,W.)
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon,Rt Hn SirW.Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt,Rt.Hn.L.(Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V.(Montrose)
Hardie, J.Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E)
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim,N)
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)

Roberts, Sir John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, G. R. (Wolverhampton
Thorne, William (West Ham)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay, T.
Wason, Rt. Hn. E. (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
William, Llewelyn (Carm'rth n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John. S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Captain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Claude Hay and Mr. George Denison Faber.

*MR. SPEAKER: The next Amendment standing in the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to add at the end of line 13 the words "or if that day is a Friday on that day," is one which increases the charge by adding one week to the pension period, if a pension is granted on a Friday, and consequently it is not in order.

Other Amendments made—

"In page 4, line 27, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words '(except in the case of a question which has been originated by the pension officer and on which the committee have already received his report).'"

"In page 4, line 37, after the first word 'The,' to insert the words 'pension officer, and any person aggrieved, may appeal to the central pension authority against a.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, to leave out from the word 'them' to the word 'referred,' in line 40, and to insert the words 'within the time and in the manner prescribed by regulations under this Act, and any claim or question in respect of which an appeal is so brought shall stand.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The House divided:—Ayes, 360; Noes, 82. (Division List, No. 179.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Sir John E. (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hon. Hubert
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, RtHn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Sir Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Curran, Peter Francis
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, Sir J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glen-Coats, Sir T. (Renfrew, W.)
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody (Bath)
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Rt. Hn. Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt Hn. L (Rossendale
Harcourt, Robert V. (Montrose)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)

Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
HarmsworthRL(Caithness-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Sir Ivor(Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Sir Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Sir Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E)
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Micdael
Meehan, Francis E. (Leitrim,N)
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Perks, Sir Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Ponsonby, Arthur A. W. H.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, WalterRussell (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts,Sir John H. (Denbighs
RobertsonSirGScott(Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M.(Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Colonel
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,Charles Edw.(Stafford)
Shaw, Rt.Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N. W.)
Stanley, Hn.A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H.J.(Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.
Thomas, SirA. (Glamorgan, E,)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset, E
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph
Ward,John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, RtHn.E(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, Sir George (Norfolk) W.

White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Rt Hn. Sir Thomas P.
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

NOES.

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Stanley
Balfour, Rt Hn. A.J. (City Lond.)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W.V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gooch, Henry Cubitt (Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Gretton, John
Guinness, Walter Edward
Haddock, George B.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Hill, Sir Clement
Hills, J. W.
Hope, James Fitzalan (Sheffield)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joynson-Hicks, William
Kerry, Earl of
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lockwood, Rt Hn. Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacCaw, William J. MacGeagh
M'Arthur, Charles
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlebrook, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Morrison-Bell, Capain
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parkes, Ebenezer
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Renton, Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ronaldshay, Earl of
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stanier, Beville
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Warde, Col. C.E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Valentia and Lord Edmund Talbot.

Other Amendments made—

"In page 5, line 28, after the word 'person,' to insert the word 'knowingly.'"

"In page 6, line 30, after the word 'pension,' to insert the words 'and for notice being given by registrars of births and deaths to the pension officers or local pension committees of every death of a person over seventy registered by them, in such manner and subject to such conditions as may be laid down by the regulations.'"

"In the Schedule, page 7, line 22, after the word 'pension,' to insert the words 'per week.'"—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

Bill to be read the third time upon Thursday.

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; Bill read the third time, and passed.

Adjourned at eighteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 8th July, 1908.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (Money) Bill; South West Suburban Water Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 25th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 18th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^a; agreed to; Bills read 2^a accordingly.

Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^a. Amendments made. Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Leeds Corporation Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further amendments made; Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Doncaster Corporation Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

London County Council (Money) Bill.—Committed.

South West Suburban Water Bill.—Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Ards Railways Bill; Holderness Water Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^a, and referred to the Examiners.

Briton Ferry Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order Bill.—House in Committee (according to Order). Bills reported without amendment. Standing Committee negatived, and Bills to be read 3^a To-morrow.

South West Suburban Water Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the five Lords appointed a Select Committee on the Manchester Corporation Bill and other Bills, do form the Select Committee for the consideration of the South West Suburban Water Bill; read, and agreed to. All petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the Petitioners praying to be heard by Counsel against the Bill to be heard as desired, as also Counsel for the Bill.

Manchester Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Blackburn Corporation Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Monk Bretton be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Earl of Stradbroke; read, and agreed to.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 4057. United States (States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana).

No. 4058. Zanzibar (Zanzibar and Pemba).

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations for training of teachers for secondary schools; Regulations for the training of teachers of domestic subjects (in force from 1st August, 1908).

WHISKEY AND OTHER POTABLE SPIRITS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into and report upon certain matters connected with the manufacture and sale of whiskey and other potable spirits; with Minutes of Evidence.

MINES AND QUARRIES.

(Explosions at Benwell and Whitehaven Collieries)—Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, edited by R. A. S. Redmayne, His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Mines, on the explosions which occurred at the Benwell Colliery on 19th March, 1907, and the Whitehaven Colliery on 26th November, 1907. (Explosion at Washington "Glebe" Colliery)—Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, by J. B. Atkinson, M.Sc., His Majesty's Inspector of Mines, on the circumstances attending an explosion

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

which occurred at Washington "Glebe" Colliery on 25th February, 1908.

ORDNANCE SURVEY.

Report of the progress of the Ordnance Survey to the 31st March, 1908, presented (by Command) and ordered to lie on the Table.

CORONERS (IRELAND) BILL.

Brought from the Commons and read 1ª, and to be printed. [No. 132.]

POST OFFICE SITES BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order). The Amendments proposed by the Committee made. Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

LORD ATKINSON moved, as an addition to Clause 1, which ran—

> "The proviso at the end of subsection 3 of Section 1 of the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act, 1907, shall not apply in any case where the tenant consents in writing to the compulsory acquisition of the land by the Estates Commissioners,"

the insertion of the following words—

> "Provided that the tenant shall sign such consent in the presence of two witnesses present at the same time, who shall attach their names thereto, and when so signed and witnessed shall be filed as a record in the office of the Land Commission, notice of such filing being, in the time and manner prescribed, given to the landlord of the land to which the consent applies, and published in two successive issues of a newspaper circulating in the district in which such land is situate; and provided further that such consent shall not be acted upon if the said landlord, or any other person interested in or having a claim upon the said lands, shall, after having an opportunity of being heard in the time and manner prescribed, satisfy the Judicial Commissioner that the tenant was compelled or induced to give such consent by intimidation or other unlawful means."

In moving his Amendment he recalled the fact that in the debate on the Second Reading of the Bill it was stated that noble Lords on the Opposition side of the House refrained from opposing the Bill in the interests of freedom. It was held that the *bona fide* planter tenants to whom the Bill applied should have conferred upon them the rights that all free men should enjoy in civilised and well-ordered communities. His Amendment was conceived in the same spirit, and directed to the same or kindred ends. If the planters were to have those rights which should belong to free men in such communities as he had mentioned, then protection ought to be thrown round them, so that they could exercise their rights freely, without being driven to abandon them by any form of coercion or intimidation.

In order that the meaning of the Amendment might be appreciated, he would state exactly what the position of the *bona fide* planter tenant was under existing legislation. The Act of last year enabled the Estates Commissioners to acquire land compulsorily; it denied to them the right to acquire tenanted land, save where the tenant was a new tenant who was not cultivating his farm in a *bona fide* manner. If he were a worthless planter, idle and neglectful, they could acquire his land; but if he were a *bona fide* farmer managing his holding according to the custom of cultivation in the district they could not. The present Bill was to enable the tenant to consent to the acquisition of the land by the Estates Commissioners and when he had given that consent he was in precisely the same position as all the other new tenants. The Estates Commissioners could buy the land, but they could not purchase from him the tenant's interest. What they could do was this—they could evict him, giving him a farm of equivalent value to that of which they had dispossessed him, or full compensation in money. That was exactly his position.

In the present Bill it was provided that the proviso at the end of subsection (3) of Section 1 of the Act of last year should not apply in any case where the tenant consented in writing to the compulsory acquisition of the land by the Estates Commissioners. How the assent was to be given save that it was to be given in writing, where it was to be given, when it was to be given, under what conditions it was to be given, or under what protection it was to be given was nowhere stated. It had occurred to him that it was imperatively necessary that some effort should be made to prevent these planters being made the object of coercion or intimidation. What was the position? The planter held land for which some of his neighbours who were evicted tenants were lusting, and observations, to which their Lordships' attention had been called on the last occasion, had been made by the Leader of the Nationalist Party, which, if he had been correctly reported, could mean little less than an exhortation and an incitement to attack and intimidate the *bona fide* planters and drive them from the homes they now occupied.

He would contrast the absence of all safeguards in reference to these men with the number of safeguards that were put round the Irish tenant when dealing with his landlord. But no coercion that the landlord could employ could be for an instant compared with that cruel and terrible form of intimidation commonly called boycotting. The crushing nature of that method of intimidation nobody could appreciate who had not seen the misery and sorrow it had brought on its victims. It was expected, when the Act of 1881 was passed, enabling tenants to get fair rents fixed, that many rents would be fixed by agreement between landlord and tenant. It was, however, found necessary to pass rules, to one or two of which he would take the opportunity of calling their Lordships' attention. It was provided that in all cases in which a tenant was a party to any agreement under the Land Act, or to any consent in writing to any document under that Act, his signature should be witnessed by a Commissioner for taking affidavits, or by other persons named in the Act, but no person in the employment of the landlord was a competent witness. If it was necessary to secure that the tenant was a perfectly free agent when he consented to settle a rent with his landlord, it was doubly necessary to see that the *bona fide* tenant planters were free agents when they were made the object of such remarks as those of Mr. Redmond, to which reference had been made. There were other rules. By Rule 143 power was reserved to any person interested in the farm to apply to have the agreement set aside on the ground of fraud or duress. If this was necessary in such a case, surely it was reasonable that some provision should be made to secure that the consent required from a *bona fide* planter before he could be turned out of his holding should be a free consent. Rule 169 was practically similar in effect. Therefore they had in Ireland a system of legislation in which the necessity was recognised that when a tenant came to parting with his rights he should be surrounded by every precaution to secure that he was acting as a free agent; and he contended that this was a thousand times more necessary in dealings under this Bill.

His Amendment was, to a great extent, drafted on the lines of the rules to which he had referred. He admitted that the Amendment standing on the Paper in the name of Lord Donoughmore was more logical than his own, but his (Lord Atkinson's) Amendment was the simpler. The Estates Commissioners acquired the land, evicted the tenants, and paid compensation. The Commissioners, therefore, were one of the parties to the negotiations and the bargain, and it seemed to him preposterous to refer to them for decision the question whether the other party was intimidated. That would be doing what was done to some degree in the Act, but which had a peculiar abhorrence for him—it allowed one of the parties to be a judge directly in his own case. Love of gain was not the only passion that warped human judgment; pride, vanity, and a desire to carry some idea had often equally actuated people in this direction. Though the Estates Commissioners had no pecuniary interest in the matter, they were not fit persons to decide whether the bargain into which they themselves had entered was a free one.

His Amendment provided for the decision of the question by an independent authority, the Judicial Commissioner. The adoption of that course would not impede matters in any way, and would prevent a man being judge in his own case. It might be that the protection would not be altogether effectual. Intimidation such as existed in Ireland was often a subtle and all-pervading thing, alienating a man's friends, following his path, thwarting his action, lurking in every corner and cranny of his life, and no machinery that could be set up would effectually protect him from it. But the more subtle its character the more imperative was it the duty of their Lordships to provide means by which the tenants might exercise in some degree the rights of free men. The noble Earl who would reply on behalf of the Government might say that this could be done by rules. That would not be strictly accurate. Rules might regulate the mode in which jurisdiction was exercised, but jurisdiction could not be conferred by rules. There was no provision on the Statute-book which enabled the Judicial Commissioner to act in these matters, and, therefore, it was necessary, if he was to have that jurisdiction, that a provision to that affect should be introduced into the Bill.

Amendment moved—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'Commissioners' to insert the words 'Provided that the tenant shall sign such consent in the presence of two witnesses present at t e same time, who shall attach their names thereto, and when so signed and witnessed shall be filed as a record in the office of the Land Commission, notice of such filing being, in the time and manner prescribed, given to the landlord of the land to which the consent applies, and published in two successive issues of a newspaper circulating in the district in which such land is situate; and provided further that such consent shall not be acted upon if the said landlord, or any other person interested in or having a claim upon the said lands, shall, after having an opportunity of being heard in the time and manner prescribed, satisfy the Judicial Commissioner that the tenant was compelled or induced to give such consent by intimidation or other unlawful means.'"—(*Lord Atkinson.*)

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, the issue raised by the Amendment moved by the noble and learned Lord in a clear and exhaustive speech is a very simple one. The object of this Bill is to prevent a planter from being coerced or intimidated into remaining on his farm when he wishes to go. The object of the noble and learned Lord's Amendment is to prevent his being coerced or intimidated into going if he wishes to stay. One hopes that occasions of this kind are not likely often to arise. As the noble and learned Lord has stated, the inducements offered by the Act as it stands are very considerable. A man either receives an equivalent farm elsewhere or else he receives the full value of his holding if he likes to go out of farming altogether.

The noble and learned Lord spoke of intimidation, which I abhor as much as he does, but, of course, it is impossible to overlook the fact that no law, though it may protect a man from violence, can protect him from unpopularity and from the hundred disagreeable incidents which accompany local unpopularity even though no violence be used. Consequently, I think it may fairly be said that in most cases the inducements for a planter to go are at any rate considerable. The noble and learned Lord desires to ensure that the planter should not be intimidated into going, and, so far as the earlier words of his Amendment are concerned, we agree that there can be no possible objection to the tenant signing such consent in the presence of two witnesses present at the same time, who shall attach their names thereto, or to the filing of the consent. I would suggest that, after the word "witnessed," the words "the said consent" should be inserted, because, as the Amendment stands, it looks almost as if either the tenant or the witnesses were to be filed in the office of the Land Commission, which would be possibly a painful and certainly a tedious process for them. There we should like to stop. We think that that ensures the necessary formality and publicity which the noble and learned Lord would desire to give to the tenant's act of renouncing his farm. We do not think it is necessary for the notice to be published in two successive issues of a local newspaper. That adds to the expense connected with the matter, without, in our opinion, contributing anything very material to the security of the tenant.

Then comes the question of the appeal. I fully admit that, if you are to have an appeal at all, the appeal suggested by the noble and learned Lord is the best that could be devised. It is infinitely preferable, in our opinion, to the very much more cumbrous process of a double appeal suggested by the noble Earl on the front bench opposite, which we think would really stultify the action of the Bill altogether. But even as regards the Amendment proposed by the noble and learned Lord, unobjectionable if you will in itself, I should like to appeal to the noble Lords opposite whether it is really necessary. It must be remembered that it is bound to involve considerable delay and necessitate great expense. It will be necessary, I suppose, to make rules limiting some time within which a landlord may lodge an appeal. I confess that there is something to my mind almost ludicrous in the notion of a judicial inquiry taking place in a case where a man asserts that he has not been intimidated, and somebody else asserts for him that he has. I can find no parallel of that in any sort of judicial procedure that takes place in any civilised country.

I should like to put it to your Lordships whether this appeal is really necessary at all. I can quite understand that it may be argued that this act on the part of the planter should be seriously and somewhat ceremoniously carried out, but how it is possible to go behind an act of that kind and to insist that the man is being intimidated when *ex hypothesi* he says he is not, is a matter which, I confess, passes my comprehension. I hope, therefore, that on consideration the noble and learned Lord would be willing to move only the first part of his Amendment down to the words "Land Commission," and would, in consideration of the great trouble to which the parties would be put if the whole Amendment was carried, consent to withdraw the rest.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE, who had given notice of an Amendment to amend Lord Atkinson's Amendment by leaving out the further proviso and inserting after the word "situate," the following words—

"And provided further that the said consent shall not be acted upon if the landlord or any other person having an interest in or claim upon the said lands shall satisfy the Estates Commissioners, after having had at the time and in the manner prescribed an opportunity of being heard, that the tenant was compelled or induced to give such consent by intimidation or other unlawful means, and the determination by the Estates Commissioners of this question shall be deemed and taken to be a determination by them of a question arising under provisions imposing restrictions on the acquisition of land within the meaning of Section 2, subsection 11, of the Evicted Tenants Act of 1907, and shall be subject to appeal accordingly,"

said he did not think the noble Earl in his final words had fairly described the position. The noble Earl had said the position was a ridiculous one that when a man had said he had not been intimidated somebody else should come forward and say that he had. But did the planter say he had not been intimidated? Unless the Government had in their mind some form of consent that the planter was to be made to give to the effect that he had not been intimidated when he gave his consent, he failed entirely to see the force of the noble Earl's argument. Their whole contention was that this consent might be obtained in some cases by intimidation, and it was in order to safeguard the planter himself in such case that they asked their Lordships to give this appeal. His reply to the noble Earl's Question, Was this appeal really necessary? was "Yes," and that it was more necessary now, owing to the administration of the law in Ireland by His Majesty's Government, than it was twelve months ago. A very peculiar case was mentioned in *The Times* about ten days ago. The statements made so surprised him that he took the trouble to obtain a copy of the local paper which contained an almost verbatim report of the case, which was concerned with cattle-driving on the De Montalt estate at Ballintemple, and the claim for compensation by the victims of that proceeding. He did not know whether it was as the result of cattle-driving or not, but the land was now to be sold, and Mr. Ryan, the solicitor for the victims, made the remarkable statement that his clients—

"Were, on the division of the demesne lands' to be allotted a portion of them by the Estates Commissioners, but the landholders resolutely opposed the Hickeys getting any portion of the estate, and the result was that the Land Commissioners gave way to them, and the Hickeys got none of the land, for the Commissioners pandered to the Crown."

That action was a practical encouragement of cattle-driving. That was the spirit in which the law was being administered at this moment, and it was this which made some such Amendment as this absolutely necessary.

*LORD ASHBOURNE admitted that if a man denied that he had been intimidated it was not easy to get over that. There was nothing so hard to ascertain in districts where feeling ran high as whether or not a man was acting as an absolutely free agent or was yielding to the insidious form of intimidation so well known in Ireland. The provision in the Bill that the proviso at the end of subsection (3) of Section 1 of the Act of last year should not apply in any case where the tenant consented in writing to the compulsory acquisition of the land by the Estates Commissioners was a rather bald one. The mere consent in writing was hardly sufficient, and could not without an addition of some kind be deemed satisfactory. He gathered that the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies practically admitted that, for he had stated that the first part of Lord Atkinson's Amendment, providing that the tenant should sign the consent in the presence of two witnesses who should attach their names thereto, was conceived in such a reasonable spirit that he was prepared to give a ready assent to it. He (Lord Ashbourne) did not suppose it would be a common case at all, but it was conceivable that there might be cases where, although the man had signed the consent in the presence of witnesses and expressed his desire to accept the terms offered him and to go, objection could still be made that that act was not quite free and that at some point or other undue pressure was exercised. It was therefore claimed to be reasonable to provide means in such a case for the matter to be investigated and decided by a fair tribunal.

*LORD CLONBROCK trusted that the Government might be induced to accept the Amendment in its entirety. No one doubted that the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies condemned intimidation as much as any one in the House. The object of the Amendment was to prevent intimidation. The fact that a planter had given in writing his consent to go did not at all imply that he had given it of his own free will, and it was perfectly legitimate to inquire whether direct intimidation had been applied Owing to the exceedingly light and airy manner in which agitation had been treated by His Majesty's Government, intimidation prevailed very widely in Ireland. The mere placing on record of the written consent in the office of the Estates Commissioners would be an absolutely nugatory proceeding, the more especially as the bargain was being made with them. Noble Lords from Ireland desired that there should be an appeal to some independent authority such as the Judicial Commissioner. He hoped the House would adopt the Amendment and reserve freedom of action to these planters.

THE EARL OF MAYO said the Amendment would not be necessary but for the open intimidation and boycotting existing in Ireland. The whole spirit in which their Lordships debated the Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act of last year was that the *bona fide* planters should be adequately protected; but in the Bill now before them it was provided that the proviso inserted in the Act of last year for the protection of the planters should not apply in any case where the tenant consented in writing to the compulsory acquisition of the land by the Estates Commissioners. The noble Earl apparently did not object to the provision in Lord Atkinson's Amendment about the two witnesses, but only to the publication in the newspapers. Noble Lords might be inclined to concede that point, because personally he did not attach great importance to the newspaper publication. The question of appeal, however, was more important. It had been fully debated last year, and now, when an Amendment was moved to protect the planters, why should not the right of appeal to the Judicial Commissioner be granted? No argument had been submitted against the right of appeal. The truth was that the present Government wanted to fire out the planters as quickly as possible. It was much better to be candid about the matter. Personally, he thought that there would not be many appeals; but, at any rate, the chance of making an appeal should be given. He suggested that "any person interested" might be a better phrase to adopt than that in the Amendment.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, I am afraid I am not convinced by the arguments of noble Lords opposite, although I fully recognise that what they have in their minds is the interest of the tenant. If I believed that this Amendment would have a serious effect in protecting or making happier people who otherwise would be intimidated, I could not refuse to accept it. But what is really going to happen suppose this Amendment is carried? Suppose, for the sake of argument, that a man has been intimidated into signing a consent. After having announced his intention of leaving, is it likely that, before Mr. Justice Wylie, he will recant and say he was intimidated, and go back to the occupation of his holding? It seems the most improbable thing to happen in practice that could be conceived. On the other hand, you have the alternative possibility, in every case where the planter wants to go, of the landlord who has a strong personal objection to the Bill, putting this unhappy man into Court, the tenant asseverating that he wants to go and the landlord assuring the Court that he ought to be allowed to remain.

LORD ATKINSON was of opinion that as the landlord would be mulcted in costs such a case would not be likely to occur.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I am not sure that all landlords would be deterred by that fact. I am afraid, therefore, that we cannot accept the Amendment. I am anxious not to put your Lordships to the trouble of dividing, which I should have to do if the Amendment before us at the moment was the one standing in the name of the noble Earl, Lord Donoughmore; but I am bound to say I cannot hold out any hope of my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary accepting this Amendment in another place.

LORD ATKINSON expressed his willingness to omit the word "landlord" and to insert the words "persons interested." His Amendment was not conceived in the interest of the landlord. The term "landlord" came in because he had, in drafting his Amendment, copied the rules to which he had referred.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I do not take it that that would lead to any change in practice, because the words "persons interested" would include the landlord. Therefore, I do not see much object in striking out the landlord in this case.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I take it there is no doubt as to the position which the great body of the Members of this House desire to take up in reference to this question of the *bona fide* planter. We desire that he should be effectually protected; but I think I may add that we only desire to protect him if he himself wishes to be protected. I take that as our point of departure. Then arises the question what evidence is to be regarded as sufficient to show that the *bona fide* planter really does desire to invoke protection.

In the Bill as presented to the House the simple consent of the tenant in writing was to be sufficient. On this side of the House, at any rate, we do not think that so imperfect a guarantee as that is sufficient for the purpose. To rely on the mere signature of the tenant, given under circumstances of which no one is very fully aware, would be, indeed, a very slight precaution. It will be within the recollection of many of us that, in the case of Lord Clanricarde's estate, signatures were appended by a great many of the tenants to statements recording their strong objection to be moved elsewhere, and that within a few days we had in our possession other signatures from the same tenants recording their desire to be allowed to accept the terms offered them by the Estates Commissioners. Therefore, I venture to think it is clearly established that the mere signature of the tenant by itself is not sufficient. I think we may also call attention to the argument used with so much effect by my noble and learned friend behind me, when he reminded the House that whenever the tenant is called upon or is allowed to part with any portion of his rights to his landlord, the transaction is shielded by any number of precautions of the very kind which my noble and learned friend desires to introduce in the present case.

I must say I was a little astonished when I heard the noble Earl who leads the House say to us, at the beginning of this discussion, that whereas we desired that the tenant should not be intimidated into leaving his farm, noble Lords opposite desired that he should not be intimidated into remaining upon it, the suggestion being, I presume, that the kind of pressure which the landlord who desires to retain a *bona fide* tenant can put upon him is comparable to the kind of pressure which is put upon these people by the Land League when they desire to drive them from their holdings. If I may be allowed to say so, I think that shows a certain absence of perspective in the view with which these questions are regarded by noble Lords opposite.

The Amendment moved by my noble and learned friend has three limbs. In the first place, he desires that the consent of the tenant of the tenant should be given in the presence of witnesses who are to attach their names thereto, the consent being filed as a record in the office of the Land Commission. That, I understand, is accepted by His Majesty's Government, and I gladly acknowledge the indication of their admission that the case of my noble and learned friend is to that extent a strong one. Then we come to the second limb of the Amendment, which is to the effect that notice of the filing of the consent is to be given to the landlord and published in two successive issues of a local newspaper. I think I caught a suggestion from my noble friend behind me that he and those who act with him do not attach great importance to that particular part of the proposal. I therefore do not dwell upon it.

Then I come to by far the most important part of the Amendment—namely, that which provides that in these cases there shall be an appeal to the Judicial Commissioner. I observed with satisfaction that the noble Earl admitted that if there was to be an appeal that was the proper appeal to provide; and, personally, I should prefer that appeal to the one suggested by my noble friend Lord Donoughmore. I ask myself, however, whether the appeal thus provided is really one which is likely to be of any great substantial value, because it seems to me clear that if precautions of this kind are to be mere paper precautions and are not to be of substantial value the fewer of them we put into this Bill the better for all concerned. My noble friend Lord Mayo admitted, I think, that appeals of this kind would be very rare. We may, therefore, assume that we are only dealing with quite a small number of cases.

Let us consider what is likely to happen in that small number of cases. You appeal to the Judicial Commissioner and you endeavour to show that the tenant has been subjected to some form of coercion. Upon whose evidence are you going to rely in order to establish your case? Remember that it is one in which the tenant *ex hypothesi* has been effectually intimidated. He has been intimidated up to the point of putting his name to a document in which he formally states that he desires to give up his farm. Is it very likely that after he has done that, after he has been so effectually coerced that he has given his consent with all these formalities—is it very likely that you will get him to recant that consent before the Judicial Commissioner? I doubt it very much. Then let us suppose that you are going to rely, not upon the evidence of the tenant, but upon the evidence of other parties. The landlord produces evidence to show that there has been cattle-driving in the neighbourhood, and that the tenant and his family have been boycotted. The evidence may be unanswerable, but the fact will remain that the tenant himself desires to leave his farm and to go to a farm in another part of the country. It will be impossible for the Judicial Commissioner or for anybody else, so it seems to me, to determine whether the consent of the tenant is really due to the boycotting and the persecution, or to the fact that he has been offered, as we know some of these people have been offered, by the Estates Commissioners extremely liberal inducements to move elsewhere.

I frankly confess that, much as I regret to differ from my noble friends who sit behind me, it does not seem to me that this part of the Amendment is likely to serve any substantially good purpose, and, for that reason, I really would put it to them whether they might not be content with the earlier portion of it, perhaps fortified by some other words, and whether, at any rate, they might not stop short of insisting either upon the full-blown Amendment of my noble friend Lord Donoughmore or upon the latter part of the Amendment of the noble and learned Lord.

*LORD CLONBROCK pointed out that they had to consider not only the case of a man who had, whether from intimidation or not, given his consent, but the effect on the people round about. What they desired to do was to make it as difficult as possible for a man to be intimidated, and if the people who were inclined to intimidate knew that there was an appeal and that the whole matter would be threshed out from the beginning before a fair tribunal, they might not be so ready in indulge in intimidation. With such a provision as that contained in the Amendment, intimidation, though it might be successful in the end, would not be so easy to practise.

THE EARL OF MAYO submitted, in regard to what had been said by Lord Lansdowne, that there were planters plucky enough to stand up and say they had been intimidated into giving their consent. If these planters did not possess that determination, he could assure their Lordships that many of them would not be where they were now. The very word "planter" was well known in the history of Ireland and spoke for itself. He admitted that the cases might not be many, but held that that did not make their argument any the weaker. The few men who had taken up this position and were farming their land in a husband-like manner were entitled to every protection. There was an important principle involved, and he hoped his noble friends from Ireland would divide on the Amendment.

LORD ATKINSON called attention to the fact that his Amendment was not confined to intimidation. Other unlawful means might be resorted to, such as bribery and violence, to coerce a tenant into giving his consent. It was perfectly absurd to suppose that a person who had no evidence to bring before the Judicial Commissioner would proffer a charge of this kind when he was certain to be beaten and to have to pay the costs. He did not suggest that the Amendment set up perfect machinery. If they were never to legislate unless they could devise perfect machinery they would never legislate at all. The value of the proviso in the Amendment was that in cases of gross intimidation means would be open for resorting to a tribunal to defeat it, and to prevent the intimidators reaping the fruits of their illegal act. For himself, he did not see any great difficulty in the Judicial Commissioner's ascertaining whether a man was acting of his own free will or not. For instance, if a man said he had made up his mind not to go and was then boycotted, and his cattle driven, and on the third day signed a consent, would any one have difficulty in saying that that consent was extracted by intimidation? Although it might not frequently be resorted to, the existence of this appeal would be of great value.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): I propose to put the Amendment down to the words "Land Commission" which, I understand, is accepted by the Government.

THE EARL OF CREWE: Would the noble and learned Lord agree to insert after the word "witness," the words "the said consent"?

LORD ATKINSON: I think it is quite unnecessary, but I have no objection to it.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES The Amendment is to add the words, "Provided that the tenant shall sign such consent in the presence of two witnesses present at the same time, who shall attach their names thereto, and when so signed and witnessed the said consent shall be filed as a record in the office of the Land Commission."

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES: The Question I now have to put to the Committee is that the words "notice of such filing," etc., down to the end of the Amendment, be there inserted.

On Question, "That those words be there inserted."

Their Lordships divided: Contents, 88; Not Contents, 36.

CONTENTS.

Bedford, D.
Somerset, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)
Ailesbury, M.
Camden, M.
Zetland, M.

Cairns, E.
Cathcart, E.
Dartrey, E.
Denbigh, E.
Devon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Halsbury, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harrowby, E.
Ilchester, E.
Londesborough, E.
Malmesbury, E.
Manvers, E.
Mayo, E.
Morley, E.
Rosse, E.
Waldegrave, E.

Cross V.
Hampden, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Iveagh, V.

Knutsford, V.
Portman, V.

Peterborough, L. Bp.

Addington, L.
Alverstone, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Atkinson, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Biddulph, L.
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Calthorpe, L.
Carysfort, L. (*E. Carysfort.*)
Castlemaine, L.
Clanwilliam, L. (*E. Clanwilliam.*)
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clonbrock, L.
Colchester, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crawshaw, L.
Dawnay, L. (*V. Downe.*)
De Mauley, L.
Digby, L.
Douglas, L. ((*E. Home.*)
Dunboyne, L. ([*Teller.*]
Fermanagh, L. (*E. Erne.*)
Fingall, L. (*E. Fingall.*)
Forester, L.
Gormanston, L. (*V. Gormanston.*)
Grey de Ruthyn, L.

Hare, L. (*E. Listowel.*)
Harris, L.
Heneage, L.
Hindlip, L.
Hylton, L.
James, L.
Kenlis, L. (*M. Headfort.*)
Kenyon, L.
Kilmarnock, L. (*E. Erroll.*)
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Lawrence, L.
Muskerry, L.
Newton, L.
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Ranfurly, L. (*E. Ranfurly.*)
Rathmore, L.
Redesdale, L.
Robertson, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sandys, L.
Savile, L.
Seaton, L.
Sherborne, L.
Sinclair, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stalbridge, L.
Stanmore, L.
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*) [*Teller.*]
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wynford, L.

NOT-CONTENTS]

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beauchamp, E. (*L. Steward.*)
Craven, E.
Crewe, E.
Cromer, E.
Jersey, E.
Liverpool, E.
Onslow, E.

Althorpe, V. (*L. Chamberlain.*)
St. Aldwyn, V.

Wolverhampton, V.

Allendale, L.
Ampthill, L.
Armitstead, L.
Colebrooke, L.
Denman, L. (*Teller.*]
Eversley, L.
Faber, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Haversham, L.

Headley, L.
Herschell, L.
Joicey, L.
Lochee, L.
Lucas, L.
Lyveden, L.
Manners, L.
Monk Bretton, L.
Pirrie, L.
Sanderson, L.
Sandhurst, L.
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Weardale, L.
Welby, L.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived; the Report of the Amendments to be received on Tuesday next, and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 133).

ECONOMIES IN THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

LORD LOVAT rose to submit a preliminary list of minor and vexatious economies adversely affecting the efficiency of the Territorial Army; and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: My Lords, I wish to call attention of your

Lordships to certain economies at present being made in the Territorial Army, which I think are rather unfortunate and hardly bear out some of the promises made by His Majesty's Government when the Territorial Army Act was brought in. We were told that the Territorial Army was to be reduced in numbers—and reduced it certainly has been—but that it was to be very much increased in efficiency. We were also told that it was to be complete in every part, and would have mobilisation arrangements sufficient to enable it to take the field at once. I regret to say that the administration of the Force so far hardly seems to tend towards that end, and unless an alteration of policy is adopted with regard to the economies which are at present being effected, we shall not get the efficiency anticipated.

The whole question of the efficiency of the Territorial Army depends upon the officers and non-commissioned officers. That is, and always will be, the weak part of any partly amateur Army. Yet one of the first acts of the Government was to abolish a most excellent institution—the Yeomanry school at Netheravon. This school gave a most excellent training to Yeomanry officers, and was well spoken of throughout. The men there worked keenly and the administration was good, picked Cavalry officers being detailed to carry on the training work. At the present moment there is no Yeomanry school, and these officers have to go to be trained to Cavalry regiments as attached officers. Any one who has been a Cavalry officer knows what happens when a Yeomanry officer is attached to a Cavalry regiment. No one cares anything about him. He will never belong to the regiment, and as for any training which he is allowed to get whilst so attached, the whole thing is a perfect farce. He will certainly never lead a troop, as he might make a mistake and the squadron officer might get abused by the officer next senior in command. Therefore, the Yeomanry officer becomes thoroughly bored, and returns to his regiment as ignorant as when he left it.

But in the Yeomanry school things were different. So keen was the work that in many cases the men used to work up to eight and ten o'clock at night in order to pass their examination. A definite object was thus achieved, and the efficiency both of Yeomanry officers and non-commissioned officers was very much advanced. I believe there is a mythical idea of training squadrons going about the country in the dim future to train men. As far as I can make out, these squadrons will have to train officers and non-commissioned officers at one and the same time. The training given to men who sit in the saddle is not the same as that given to a major or captain, who desires instruction in general tactical work. Yet apparently, if the training squadron scheme is carried out on the lines indicated by Lord Granard, this will be the only means of training our officers now that the Yeomanry school has been abolished. I believe the abolition of that school to be a downward step affecting the future efficiency of the Yeomanry officers.

The next economy I wish to draw attention to is in connection wit hthe permanent staff. Three days ago this was a very burning question, but I am glad to hear that an announcement was made to-day that the Government have again issued new regulations on the subject. I will not, therefore, trouble your Lordships with things of the past. But there are certain reductions which it is still necessary to draw attention to. The permanent staff is at all times a perfectly necessary body to the Territorial Army, but more so at the present moment, because recruiting and training are very largely in the hands of the permanent staff. If you make that staff dissatisfied, as they are at present, you will not get efficient work out of them. I understand that their pay in certain circumstances has been altered back to what it was before, but there are still distinct grievances. First of all there is the £18 they used to draw every year for accommodation allowance, and also the £6 10s., the limit allowed for duties outside their regular work. These have been cut down. In cases where accommodation is provided for them in drill halls, or otherwise, the £18 is not paid. Formerly, if their lodging in, say, a little annex to a barracks was rated at £7 a year, they were allowed to draw the balance. That is not so under the present arrangement. The question of travelling warrants is, I believe, under consideration, and I hope that that of the £6 10s. 0d. allowance for work outside regular duties will also be considered, because that is a matter of very great importance to non-commissioned officers doing clerical work.

I turn from the permanent staff to the brigade staff. The £50 allowed to run the brigade office is a very great grievance to Regular officers. They have to pay for a clerk, for office expenses, telegrams, stationery, etc., and these offices cannot be maintained for less than £90 or £100 a year, so that the officers have to make up the balance. Economies in the case of other than Regular officers are to be deprecated; but it is extremely hard, in the case of a soldier who has left his regiment with the idea of drawing from £100 to £150 a year clear pay, that he should have to refund to the Government £40. Yet the Regular officer on half-pay has to make up the difference in order to enable the Government to effect this economy. I think this may justly be described as not very generous conduct.

The next question to which I wish to refer is that of the grant in respect of horses. The Yeomanry were promised in your Lordships' House by Lord Portsmouth, when he occupied the position of Under-Secretary of State for War, that they should draw £5 allowance for every horse in the regiment. We still draw that allowance, but it is subject to certain reductions. In the first place, the horse establishment has been reduced by fifty-three horses per regiment. That does not make for efficiency, since, during the fifteen or sixteen days training, fifty-three men have to be left in camp every day, because there are no horses for them to ride. Yet we were told that the Territorial Army was to be complete in every part. If you do not give the men sufficient horses how are you going to teach them to ride? Under this arrangement you will always have a large number of loafers in camp who have nothing to do, and the result will be that these men will not get sixteen days training. I do not see how it can be said that this will add to the efficiency of the Yeomanry. This £5 allowance per horse is further subject to insurance money and to veterinary expenses incurred during camps and as a result of the training, and sometimes these amounts are very heavy. The man may find that he has lost most of his £5 in veterinary expenses getting his horse back to a sound state of health. I certainly think veterinary assistance is a matter which the State ought to pay for.

Next, I would like to call attention to the unfortunate economies which have been made in the training kit—I mean in wagons, ammunition carts, water carts, saddlery, and other things of that sort, which ought to have been long ago issued to the various units. I hear from three commands that there is a great shortage in this training kit, especially in the direction of wagons and harness for ambulance, transport and supply, and ammunition columns. Under these circumstances it is difficult to get the full amount of training out of the men. It is quite possible that this may not be considered fair criticism seeing that this is the first year of the new force; but it is essential that the maximum amount of training should be got out of the men this year. A sufficient number of Artillery non-commissioned officers are not coming forward to join the Territorial Army, and I believe that to be due to the unfortunate reports which have got about as to the docking of their pay. That may or may not be so, but at all events the number of training sergeants is not up to the establishment, which I think everyone will admit was meagre enough at the best.

Another unfortunate economy has been made in the direction of the doctors' fees, the sum of 2s. 6d. for passing a man as medically fit having been reduced to 1s. The result is that only a certain number of doctors will examine the men, and therefore you have to pay the fares of the men to go to be examined, which may cost more than the money you save. It is said that this economy would lead to regular medical officers doing more work than in the past, but I do not think there is much in that. There is only one depot in a county; many counties have no depot at all, and the travelling expenses of the men going to be examined amount in some places to more than is saved by the reduction. My noble friend Lord Harris proposes to call attention to the question of loss in pay and allowances, and therefore I will not touch upon that.

There is, however, only one other matter to which I should like to refer—the question of mobilisation. We have not up to now seen any mobilisation kit; yet if the Territorial Force is to be efficient it must be able to mobilise at once, otherwise it will be as big a sham as the Volunteer Force was in the past. As far as one can see, no move has yet been made in this direction. I am fully aware that the War Office has had considerable difficulties to contend with and has been compelled to issue a great many new regulations from time to time to meet them. But I think we ought not to shut our eyes to the fact that until we have full opportunities for training the men and making the mobilisation arrangements not a sham but a reality, we shall not have taken any step forward in the line of progress.

LORD HARRIS, who had given notice, "To call attention to the serious loss in pay and allowances suffered by Yeomanry officers of certain ranks under the Territorial Army Regulations, and to various changes in the Regulations as regards Yeomanry training and drill which are not likely to secure greater efficiency," said: My Lords, perhaps the noble Lord the Under-Secretary would prefer that I should address my observations to the House now so that he may be able to reply to my noble friend and myself in one speech. Although my noble friend below me acknowledged that it might, perhaps, be rather captious to criticise the Regulations of the Territorial Army too closely in its first year, some of the points to which I propose to call attention are not affected by that admission.

I desire to call your Lordships' attention to the differences in pay which have been suffered by the officers who have transferred from the Yeomanry to the Territorial Army. The Secretary of State for War gave an undertaking in another place that those who transferred from the old Yeomanry to the Territorial Force would be secure in their emoluments. I cannot specify the exact speech in which that statement was made, but I am sure a declaration to that effect was made in the other House by the Secretary of State. Therefore, we were under the impression that in transferring from the Yeomanry to the Territorial Army we would not be losers. The noble Lord may say, "You are free men, you had a month in which to consider the new terms, and, therefore, if you have got worse terms than you had in the Imperial Yeomanry it is your own lookout." That is perfectly true, but it is not the practice of Yeomanry officers to study the pay regulations. They were quite under the impression that they would be no sufferers by the transfer.

I do not pretend to say that the difference in pay to which I shall presently draw the attention of your Lordships is going to cause officers to leave the Territorial Army or to deter others from taking up commissions; but, having regard to the fact that during the past seven years the Yeomanry had progressed more satisfactorily than any other branch of His Majesty's Army, it is an ungrateful return that those gentlemen responsible for that improvement should have a greater pecuniary burden thrown on their shoulders than when they were in their old service. I do not know whether my figures are absolutely correct. The noble Lord the Under-Secretary will have an opportunity of criticising them, but I have taken every step, outside of going to the War Office, to secure their accuracy. I calculate that a major with more than two years' service will lose 19s. upon his fifteen days' training, and a major with less than two years' service will lose 7s. 6d. and also the squadron-drill pay which he has drawn annually since the noble Viscount on the Front Opposition Bench, Viscount Midleton, granted a day's pay for two day's squadron drill, making a total of £1 12s. 6d. A captain loses 1s. 10½d. a day, which with his squadron-drill pay, amounts to £2 10s.; a lieutenant loses £2 15s. 2d.; a second lieutenant, £2 14s. 2d.; and a veterinary surgeon—the hardest worked man, probably, in the regiment during the fifteen days' training—loses something over £2 11s. These amounts may not appear to your Lordships very serious; but if you apply this to the case of a Regular officer you will find that it amounts, in the case of a subaltern, to docking him of something like £50 of his annual subaltern's pay.

I have mentioned the abolition of the squadron-drill pay. I do not know that, outside the £5 per horse, there was a more useful advantage given by my noble friend below me than squadron-drill pay. It is difficult, in the case of men resident in towns, for them to get to a place where squadron drill can be carried out. The regulations laid down that a certain number had to be present, and it was important to get that number in order that the men might draw squadron-drill pay. The men had to hire in a great many cases, and they hired out of the squadron-drill pay. The abolition of this pay affects some regiments very seriously. I know of one regiment which assembles for two or three days' drill at Easter. It goes to a town where a cavalry regiment is quartered; it has the adantage of horses being lent to it, and it uses the squadron-drill pay for the carriage of the men to and fro and for their messing when they are there. The whole of the cost in the future, as far as I can see, will be thrown either on the men or on the officers. In the same way, one of the squadrons in my regiment assembles for two days previous to the training and puts in its squadron drills in that way. It is a squadron raised entirely in a large town and it has difficulty in doing squadron drill at any other time. By means of the squadron-drill pay it was enabled to put in those two days' drill at a small cost to the men. That has now been altered, and I am afraid that it will place difficulties in the way of the men attending the squadron drill.

I always understood that the object of the great change that has been made —shall I be using too strong a word if I say the confusion that has been created ? —and the labour that has been thrown upon a large number of civilians, and, presumably, has been thereby taken off the War Office, was greater efficiency. As regards the Yeomanry, the effect will be that they will lose one day's training annually, and the men will have greater difficulty than before in getting to the mounted squadron drills. I endorse entirely what my noble and gallant friend below me has said as to the training of young officers. I remember the old school at Aldershot; Colonel Oakes was in command, and Captain Percy Barrow had charge of the school. It is impossible to conceive a more thorough training than an officer got at that school. You had to do everything on paper; you then had to do everything with rope drill in the yard; and then you went out in the field on horseback and did the same thing; and if a young officer was not thoroughly trained, not only to lead a troop, but to lead a squadron—and he might be even certified to be competent to command a regiment—it was absolutely his own fault. Now that is all changed.

Lord Harris.

There were a great many Yeomanry officers who preferred the idea of a young officer being sent to a regiment. I never have preferred that, for this reason. The capacity of imparting your own knowledge to other people is not given to everyone, and it may so happen that in a regiment there is not one squadron leader who is capable of imparting what he knows himself, and yet he may be the smartest possible officer; whereas the officer at the school was engaged in the practice of teaching during the whole of the year, and he could not help being an efficient schoolmaster. I know this from my own experience. These young officers now come back not nearly as well trained as the young officers who were at the Yeomanry school. Although attached to a regiment they are not even given a troop to lead during the whole course of the month. How, therefore, can they be expected, when they return, to be competent to lead men who are not so well trained as regulars? I hope we shall see a training squadron in every divisional area, and that at the head will be an officer who is competent to teach. Otherwise there will be no advantage in the training squadron over the present system.

There is another thing. Remember it is claimed that the new regulations are going to produce greater efficiency. Whereas under the old regulations a young officer was compelled to go to the school at Aldershot or to a regiment, as the case might be, within the first two years of his service, he now need not go until he is within sight of the command of a squadron, which may not be for six or seven years, and then he need only go for a fortnight. I should imagine that commanding officers would take care that their officers did go, but it is not provided by the regulations. So far as the War Office are concerned, they have lowered the chance of a young officer's being properly trained, and that is not likely to conduce to greater efficiency. I also endorse what my noble and gallant friend has said regarding the allowance that was given for veterinary expenses subsequent to training. I think that to cut off the veterinary expenses after they have been given during the last five or six years is very harsh. It is often no fault of the man that his horse is injured or goes sick. I had a number of cases of sickness last year. There happened to be a particularly cold snap the first night, and sixteen or seventeen horses were laid up with pneumonia. I had previously applied for blankets, but they were refused. I think it is very hard that men who put in this service should have to pay veterinary expenses out of their own pocket. In many speeches made in the country as to what was going to be done under the Territorial Army scheme, promises were, I submit, given that no man who served should suffer in pocket, and it seems to me that something like a breach of that engagement has taken place. The new men will receive, I estimate, about 1s. 6d. a day less than the old Yeomen, and I am honestly afraid that when that difference comes to be noticed during next year's training it will detract from the popularity of the Force. As long as the Force was properly treated there was no chance of its falling off in numbers or in efficiency. I hope that in the course of the next year the Secretary of State may be disposed to reconsider the matter, and, if possible, grant some concessions which will make up for what the officers and men have lost.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Lord Lucas): My Lords, I have to thank the noble Lords who have spoken for having given me notice of the points which they intended to raise, and I will endeavour to deal with them as shortly as I can. First of all, there was the question of the form of instruction given to young officers. We quite agree, to a certain point, that the instruction which was imparted to the young officers at Netheravon was in most cases superior to that which they received when they were attached to a Regular regiment, and if the accommodation at Netheravon were unlimited and the training staff available it would propably have conduced to higher efficiency if we had been able to continue the arrangement. But that was not the case, and now the higher training given to the Regular Cavalry absorbs all our resources there. We propose, however, to form instructional classes—not necessarily on the lines of the training squadron spoken of at an earlier stage of this scheme—in each command in the country, which we hope young officers will be able to attend. As to the permanent staff, that has been dealt with in a circular which is shortly to be issued, and which will meet a good many of the points raised by Lord Lovat.

With regard to housing, we have always regarded the £18 as strictly a lodging allowance, and not as a sum to be spent partly on lodging and partly as a bonus to the men. We feel, therefore, that, if quarters are available in which properly to house the instructor, the purpose of the lodging allowance is served, and that he is not entitled to whatever may be left of the £18 over the value of the housing afforded him. The sum of £6 10s. is what we consider to be the right amount to be given per company under normal conditions. Should exceptional conditions arise under which it is inevitable that the expenses should be greater, we shall treat those as special cases and shall be prepared to meet them and make a larger grant. But, after having gone very carefully into the question, we think that under ordinary conditions the grant of £6 10s. per company ought to be sufficient.

Then there is the question of the brigade staff. The expenses with regard to the brigade staff have steadily mounted up. First of all the brigade-major received, I think, £100 and the brigadier £150, with £25 for office expenses. Then to that was added the £40 travelling allowance, and now, under the present scheme, we have doubled the grant for office expenses, and we pay £50 to the County Association for the headquarters of the brigade; this is given as an administrative grant. That, we think, ought to cover the expenses. With all due respect to what Lord Lovat has said, I think it is impossible at this early stage to say that the running of the headquarters of a brigade is going to cost £90 or £100. We cannot see that there is anything in this scheme which is going so largely to increase the work of the brigadier and the brigade-major that it will not be adequately covered by doubling, as we have done, the grant for office expenses. In all these things we are at the present moment more or less in the dark, and if, in time to come, it is found that this is inadequate, and that the expenses are out of all proportion to the grant, that would be a fair case to bring up, and we should be glad to consider it on its merits.

With regard to the establishment of horses in the Yeomanry, what is taken into account is that you must have a certain number of men whose duties will confine them to camp, and who will not have a chance of going out with the regiment. Therefore there is no need to mount them. I think the Yeomanry are to have eight dismounted men per squadron. A Regular Cavalry regiment has, I think, twelve dismounted men per squadron, and the war establishment of the old Yeomanry was ten dismounted men per squadron. I know that in a Yeomanry regiment you are bound to have a certain number of casualties among the horses, and that it is very useful to have spare horses on which to mount the men. That raises the very big question of whether you are to take what amounts to a reserve of horses to camp, and that is a question which must be considered on its merits. It is impossible to turn out the whole of the strength you take to camp, even if you have horses for them, and I do not see that you require horses for men who cannot, in any circumstances, go out to camp. The new scheme only allows for that, and provides that horses shall not be required for those men who have to stay in camp.

The issue of *materiel* generally has been a very big and difficult work. We have done our best to get it out in time, but if the noble Lord knows of cases where harness and wagons and equipment generally are available and have not been served out I hope he will bring them before us, because the thing we wish above all others is to equip the Territorial Army as rapidly as possible. Then reference was made to the present paucity of instructors, particularly in the Artillery. I have said before in this House, and I say it again, that the provision of instructors for the Territorial Field Artillery at the present moment is a matter of the utmost difficulty. It is the worst time in the whole year for finding these men. All our Regular Artillery officers are going out for training, practice camps, and the rest of it, and on the work they do will depend their reports for the year, which are of the greatest importance to the individuals concerned. It would be very hard on an officer commanding a battery if you asked him to hand over to the Territorial Force two or three of his best non-commissioned officers just when he was going out to practice camp. Therefore I would beg of the Territorial Force generally that they should exercise patience in this matter. We are going to supply these men as quickly as we possibly can, but it would be disastrous if you insisted on their being sent at such a time. It would mortify the Regular Artillery, and it would not tend to improve the relations between them and the Territorial Field Artillery. If the Territoral Artillery will exercise patience we shall be able to supply them with men in the long run, and it would not be of any advantage to press the matter now.

As to the doctors' fees, a grant is made of 1s. for every recruit who is passed. A considerable percentage of the recruits have been examined either by the regimental doctor or by some public-spirited and patriotic local practitioner, who has done the work for nothing. We have every reason to believe, in view of the extremely generous and public-spirited way in which the whole medical profession has come forward to help this scheme, that we shall continue to receive their assistance. But the County Associations will draw their 1s. for every man whether he has been examined free or not, and we hope that this will enable them to meet those cases where a fee of 2s. 6d. has to be paid. I do not think that in all cases you will have to pay as much as 2s. 6d. It was stated at a meeting which Lord Lovat and I attended to-day that in one county—and it was a Scottish county—the doctors did the work for 1s.

As to mobilisation, we are working out the general mobilisation requirements and we are trying to meet them with the equipment that we have. The work is not as yet in an advanced stage. The officials at the War Office have worked in a splendid way, but our time has been taken up in meeting immediate requirements. But I can assure the noble Lord that the mobilisation requirements are by no means forgotten, and that it is our intention to work them out in full and to have the equipment ready as soon as possible. As to pay, to which Lord Harris referred, if my memory serves me the pledges that were given as regards the Yeomanry being allowed to continue at their own rates of pay until the end of their term applied to the men but not to the officers. The officers did not join for a definite term as the men did. I have the figures here as to the actual pay of the officers, but they are in a slightly different form from that given by Lord Harris, and I could not check his figures. Under the previous scheme the officer had to pay for the forage of his horse, but now the forage is found for him.

*LORD HARRIS: I made that allowance.

LORD LUCAS: In that case I think our figures differ. Under the old scheme a lieutenant-colonel commanding drew, in pay and allowances, 31s. 6d.; at the present time he draws 34s. 6d. That is a clear gain of 3s. Besides that, you have to take into account the foraging of his horse, which we put down at 1s. 4d.

*LORD HARRIS: I did not mention the colonel at all.

LORD LUCAS: The noble Lord exercised a wise discretion in leaving him out.

*LORD HARRIS: I dealt with those officers who have suffered loss.

LORD LUCAS: A major under the old scheme received 25s.; he will now receive 24s. 6d., the forage for the horse being equivalent to 1s. 4d. The major second in command, received 26s. under the old scheme; he now receives 25s. 6d.; the ordinary major now receives 24s., as against 25s. under the old scheme. The captain will receive 21s. 1½d., as against 23s.; the lieutenant 15s. 2d., as against 17s. 8d.; and the second lieutenant 14s. 2d., as against 16s. 8d. But, of course, there must be added to what they now receive the forage for the horse, which is equivalent to 1s. 4d. We admit that there is here a certain amount of modification in the pay of the lower ranks of officers, but, on the whole, in the future they will come out the gainers, for the reason that in future all new officers will draw £20 outfit allowance and be provided with saddlery.

*LORD HARRIS: How about the veterinary officer?

LORD LUCAS: I am sorry I have not got the figures with regard to the veterinary officer.

A NOBLE LORD: A wise discretion on the part of the Under-Secretary.

LORD LUCAS: Then I come to the question of squadron-drill pay. I am sure all noble Lords will agree with what has been said as to the admirable and efficient body represented by the Yeomanry Force, and as to their value in our military scheme. But it should not be forgotten that the Yeomanry have enjoyed exceptional advantages in respect of pay for squadron drill. When the Yeomanry and the Volunteers are now members of one and the same Force, it is obviously difficult to continue these exceptional advantages in the matter of pay, which are not given to their comrades in the other branch of the Force. Pay for drill has never been given to the Volunteers; it has been confined to the training camp period; and I have heard no overwhelming argument to show that the Yeomanry should be placed in a different position from the Volunteers.

*LORD HARRIS: The Volunteers have not had to find horses.

Lord LUCAS: The men who bring their own horses to camp and draw the £5 can bring their own horses to the drill. Those who hire horses can arrange that the £5 they pay will cover the hire for drill; and if there are any men not included in this you have £150 per squadron for horse-hire which ought to be sufficient.

*Lord HARRIS: We had that before.

Lord LUCAS: The General Officer Commanding can, if he thinks it will conduce to the increased efficiency of the Yeomanry, pay for extra days training. Finally, as regards the training of young officers, we do not lay down any longer the rule that they must carry out their instructional course during the first two years after joining the regiment. On the other hand, we do not propose to give way in respect of the efficiency to be exacted. An actually higher standard is set than has been the case when it comes to be a question of promotion. At the same time, a greater amount of elasticity is allowed through not confining the instruction to the first two years after joining the regiment. Some of the keenest and best officers have found it impossible in the first two years to go through their instructional course. I think I have now answered all the points raised.

Viscount MIDLETON: Can the noble Lord tell us what the net saving is on the whole cost of the Yeomanry by these changes of pay and allowances?

Lord LUCAS: I cannot carry those figures in my head; but I can say that the whole of the Territorial Force is estimated to cost £500,000 more than the Yeomanry and Volunteers cost before.

Viscount MIDLETON: I think that generalisation is rather an unfortunate one, because it does not tend to reassure us. Your Lordships are quite aware that up to the time of the reorganisation of the Yeomanry there was great difficulty in filling the ranks of both men and officers. That was overcome, and for some years there has been no difficulty in filling the ranks, and the certificates of efficiency given by the inspecting officer were, as I know, having seen most of them, absolutely convincing as to the advantage of the change. But now the noble Lord has given us, in reply to my noble friends, a long list of the adjustments and modifications in the pay and allowances of officers, and he has been warned by both noble Lords that the effect of these changes has not been at all advantageous to either the officers or the men of the Force. I do not wish to enter, on this occasion certainly, into the whole question of the advisability of what has been done with regard to the Territorial Army; but I urge the noble Lord not to allow the establishment of some fancied equality between the Yeomanry and the Territorial Infantry and Volunteers to lead him to make just those changes which will impair efficiency and prevent our obtaining the same class of men and the same number of officers as before. We have almost everything connected with the Army in the melting-pot at the present moment. The one Force in connection with which nothing could be said was the Yeomanry, which was full of men and had its full complement of officers. I take exception, if I may venture to do so, to the noble Lord's tone, establishing a reason for this and that; the main thing is that the noble Lord cannot show that there is substantial economy. There might be something to be said for the reduction if the money must be applied in other quarters. If these modifications should tend to a considerable change in the present highly useful condition of the Yeomanry Force, then I think nobody will regret it more than those who are responsible on the front bench. Therefore, I would ask the noble Lord not to allow this discussion to terminate in his mind with what has been said to-day, and not to allow a fancied consistency to stand in the way of leaving matters where they were if a change is not clearly for the public advantage.

Lord LOVAT: My Lords, I had a Motion down to move for Papers, but as this is only a preliminary list of the economies which have been effected, I do not propose to move for Papers at the present time. But I would like to call attention to two important admissions which have been made by Lord Lucas—first, that the training this year has been very short of permanent staff; and, secondly, that there has been a shortage of *materiel.* The training, therefore, cannot have been so good as it might have been in a normal year. I hope His Majesty's Government will bear this in mind, and that arrangements will be made for winter classes this year.

***LORD HARRIS**: Perhaps the noble Lord will allow me to ask a Question arising out of the Answer he has just given. He stated that, whatever statements were made with regard to their being no loss of pay on transfer to the Territorial Army, those statements were never meant to apply to officers. Therefore, the noble Lord admits that a promise was made to the men. How, then, does he excuse the withdrawal of the squadron-drill pay?

LORD LUCAS: We have never considered the squadron drill as part of the training. What we said was that the men who did transfer should continue their present rate of pay during the training period and until the end of their term of service, and that has been carried out.

House adjourned at five minutes past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 8th July, 1908.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Ards Railways Bill (changed from "Ards and Bangor Railways Bill").—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

King's Consent signified.—Bill read the third time, and passed.

Holderness Water Bill.—As amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

King's Consent signified.—Bill read the third time, and passed.

Rochester Bridge Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Leith Burgh Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill.—Considered; to be read the third time upon Friday.

Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—Garw and Ogmore Gas Bill; Swinton and Mexbrough Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to dispense with the attendance of jurors at Assizes and Quarter Sessions, and with the holding of Assizes and Quarter Sessions in certain cases, and to amend the Law relating to the dates at which Quarter Sessions are to be held." [Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill [Lords.]

PETITIONS.

CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING BILL.

Petitions against: From Thornbury; and North Bradley; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Gunnersbury, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour: From Ashford; Bryn Newydd and other places; Greenfield; Hetton Downs; Houghton le Spring; Liverpool; Newport (Mon.); Painscastle; Waterloo; and Willesden Green; to lie upon the Table.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Petition from Govan, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Wainfleet, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WHISKEY AND OTHER POTABLE SPIRITS (ROYAL COMMISSION.)

Copy presented, of Interim Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into and report upon certain matters connected with the manufacture and sale of Whiskey and other Potable Spirits, with Minutes of Evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EXPLOSIONS (BENWELL AND WHITEHAVEN COLLIERIES).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, edited by R. A. S. Redmayne, His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Mines, on the Explosions which occurred at the Benwell Colliery on 19th March, 1907, and the Whitehaven Colliery on 26th November, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EXPLOSIONS (WASHINGTON "GLEBE" COLLIERY).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by J. B. Atkinson, esquire, M.Sc., one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, on the circumstances attending an Explosion which occurred at Washington "Glebe" Colliery, on 20th February, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Secondary Schools [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Scheme for a new Teachers' Registration Council proposed to the Board of Education by the Representatives of certain Educational Associations [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Report of the Progress of the Ordnance Survey to 31st March, 1908 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 4057 and 4058 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Paper laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.

Inquiries into Charities (County of London).—Further Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August, 1894; *Mr. Francis Stevenson*]; to be printed. [No. 218.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS. CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Police Convalescent Home at Brighton.

MR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is necessary for a Metropolitan police constable to obtain the sanction of a police surgeon to enter the police convalescent home at Brighton as a non-paying patient; whether the inspector in charge of the sub-division has the authority to inform the surgeon that such a recommendation will not be entertained; and, if not, what is the constable's remedy.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Any constable, when on leave, may enter the convalescent home at Brighton and remain there at his own expense, but he can only go there as a sick man free of cost to himself on the recommendation of the divisional surgeon, ratified by chief surgeon. The sub-divisional inspector has not power to grant or withhold sick leave.

Seating Accommodation in Motor Cabs.

MR. COOPER: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the hinged seat behind the driver's seat in motor-cabs conforms with the regulations as to seating in four-wheeled cabs required by the Metropolitan Police; whether he has consented to a different width of seating in motor cabs from that required in four-wheeled cabs; and, if not, by whose authority has this regulation been altered.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The regulations do not lay down specific dimensions for seating accommodation in four-wheeled horse cabs. In those motor cabs which are licensed to carry two persons the hinged seat behind the driver is merely an emergency seat and does not conflict with any regulations as to construction.

Franco-British Exhibition and the Cab Radius.

MR. COOPER: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Franco-British Exhibition is outside the London four-mile cab radius; whether he is aware that the police refuse to allow hansom and four-wheeled cab-drivers to take up fares outside the exhibition unless they are showing a board stating they do not charge the 1s. mileage allowed by the Home Secretary's Order; whether he has issued any fresh order dealing with fares from this exhibition; and, if not, by whose authority has this regulation been forced upon the hansom and four-wheeled cabmen.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The exhibition is outside the four-mile radius. No order dealing with fares from this exhibition has been made, nor indeed, in view of the statutory provision as to the radius, could any such order be made for other than taximeter cabs. It is not the case that the police refuse to allow hansom and four-wheeled cabs to take up fares unless they exhibit such a notice as is mentioned in the Question.

Irish Firms and Post Office Stores Contracts.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that his predecessors authorised separate contracts for uniforms, clothing, caps, etc., for Ireland; and whether he will reconsider the matter of separate contracts for Irish requirements in such articles as waterproof clothing, bicycles, boots, tools, or cause a Departmental inquiry to be held into the whole subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Separate tailoring and head-dress contracts for Irish Post Office staff are arranged. The tailoring contracts go to Irish firms, the head-dress prices quoted by Irish firms are usually prohibitive. Separate boot contracts for Ireland were formerly placed, but the plan was discontinued because the prices quoted by the few Irish firms that competed were very high. Irish firms can compete for the general supply, and, if a reasonable tender were received, I should not object to delivery in Dublin. Irish tenders for waterproofs have been at prohibitive prices, I know of no toolmakers in Ireland, and of only one bicycle-making firm on any considerable scale. The latter does not reply to invitations to tender. This Department would of course be glad to hear of any competent firms in Ireland, and possibly something in this direction will result from the arrangement that has just been made with the Dublin Industrial Development Association.

Isle of Lewis Farms.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the names of the various farms in the Island of Lewis, the acreage of each such farm, and the date on which in each case the lease expires; and, in view of the fact that the Congested Districts Board have created only thirty-two crofter holdings in the island since the Congested Districts Board Act of 1897 came into force, will the Board make efforts to induce the proprietor to break up some of these farms and assist in the creation of new holdings, especially bearing in mind that on 31st March last the Board had a balance of £40,000, a sum which will be augmented this year by £35,000.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am able, by the courtesy of the proprietor, to give my hon. friend the information he desires as follows—

Farms in the Lewis paying above £30 rent.

Farm.	Rent. £	s.	Extent. Acres.	Lease.
Stornoway Parish :				
Melbost - - - - -	90	0	215	Martinmas, 1911.
Holm - - - - - -	132	0	200	Whit-Sunday, 1910.
Stoneyfield - - - - -	60	0	165	No lease.
Goathill - - - - -	95	0	144	Whit-Sunday, 1915.
Manor - - - - - -	178	0	300	No lease.
Laxdale - - - - -	40	0	38	Whit-Sunday, 1919.
Tong - - - - - -	38	0	360	,, 1917.
Coll - - - - - -	80	0	2,227	,, 1916.
Gress farm and mill - -	131	0	4,228	No lease.
North Tolsta - - - -	60	0	2,353	Whit-Sunday, 1916.
Barvas Parish :				
South Galson - - - -	235	0	6,175	Whit-Sunday, 1923.
Dell lands and mill - -	68	0	160	No lease.
Dalbeg - - - - - -	50	0	1,930	,,
Uig Parish :				
Mealista - - - - -	85	0	5,440	No lease.
Mangersta - - - - -	70	0	1,920	,,
Ardroil - - - - -	150	0	9,500	Whit-Sunday, 1912.
Timisgary - - - - -	45	0	5,096	,, 1912.
Reef - - - - - -	76	10	600	,, 1910.
Garynahine Hotel lands and fishings - - - -	90	0	1,000	Martinmas, 1911.
Croir - - - - - -	40	0	520	Whit-Sunday, 1919.
Linshader - - - - -	50	0	10,800	Martinmas, 1915.
Lochs Parish :				
Arnish - - - - - -	35	0	2,606	Whit-Sunday, 1917.
Crobeg - - - - - -	110	0	4,908	No lease.
Valtos - - - - - -	30	0	580	,,

The Congested Districts Board will be glad to co-operate with the proprietor in making new small holdings in suitable areas.

Reformatory Returns.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the records of person convicted of crime or committed to reformatories are kept in such a way as to enable a Return to be prepared showing in what class of school such persons received their education, if any, ; whether such information is available for a period of years in any tabulated form ; and, if not, whether he would cause such Return to be prepared.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The information which my hon. friend desires is not available, and I fear it would be impracticable to attempt to obtain it. I understand, however, that the Report of the Royal Commission on the Feeble-minded will contain some information as to the after school life of "special school" children.

Arrears of Tenant-Purchasers' Annuities.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the figures as to arrears of tenant-purchasers' annuities under the Purchase Act of 1903 and the previous purchase Acts cannot be procured without difficulty by the Estates Commissioners ; is it a fact that the arrears under all the Acts are inconsiderable and that they are even less under the Act of 1903 than under the previous Acts ; and whether, in view of the forthcoming measure to provide funds for the payment of the £40,000,000 worth of land now outstanding, he will publish these figures without delay, as the best proof that advances under this Act are not attended with any loss or danger to the Imperial taxpayer.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) The following table shows the total number of payers and amount collectible for year ending 1st November, 1907 (gale days under Nos. 1 and 2), and 1st December, 1907 (gale day under No. 3), of land purchase annuitants to whom advances were made under: (1) Purchase of Land (Ireland) Acts, 1885 to 1888 ; (2) Purchase of Land (Ireland) Acts, 1891 to 1896 ; and (3) Irish Land Act, 1903, together with the number and amount in arrear on 31st March, 1908 and on 1st July, 1908—

Acts.	Total number of payers.	Amount collectible.	Number of payers and amount in arrear.			
			On 31st March, 1908.	Amount.	On 1st July, 1908.	Amount.
		£		£		£
(1) 1885–8 -	25,382	369,190	1,206	10,945	334	2,900
(2) 1891–6 -	46,837	517,943	1,213	10,350	374	3,920
(3) 1903 -	44,773	561,858	998	9,176	305	2,312
Totals -	116,992	1,448,991	3,417	30,471	1,013	9,132

Note.—No. (1) Of the £10,945 due 31st March, 1908, £1,173 was due by 120 payers who owed more than one instalment. No. (2) Of the £10,350 due 31st March, 1908, £2,813 was due by 206 payers who owed more than one instalment. No. (3) Of the £9,176 due 31st March, 1908, £1,266 was due by 72 payers who owed more than one instalment.

Disposal of Discarded Service Weapons.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Brussels Conference will consider the possibility of an arrangement being arrived at between friendly Powers that service weapons which are discarded shall not be disposed of to the manifest detriment of any friendly Power.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) The Conference now sitting at Brussels has for its object the framing of regulations more stringent than those provided for by the Brussels Act to restrict the import of arms into Africa. Such an arrangement as the hon. Member suggests would hardly come within the scope of the Conference.

Loch Sween Oyster Fishery.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland what is the area at Loch Sween in respect of which a monopoly of oyster and mussel fishery was created by the oyster and Mussel Fisheries (Loch Sween) Order Confirmation Act, 1891; what rent has been paid by the persons who obtained that monopoly; and what sums have been expended by them on laying down spat or young oysters, or otherwise improving the oyster and mussel beds, during the seventeen years that they have had that monopoly.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The area included in the Loch Sween Order represents 4,162 acres. The rent since 1901 has been £12 per annum. I am informed that the estimated total outlay by the lessees has exceeded £1,800, and so far they have received no return for this outlay.

West Loch Tarbert Oyster Fishery.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE: To ask the Secretary for Scotland what is the area at West Loch Tarbert in respect of which a monopoly of oyster and mussel fishery was created by the Oyster and Mussel Fisheries (West Loch Tarbert) Order Confirmation Act, 1888; what rent has been paid by the persons who obtained that monopoly; and what sums have been expended by them on laying down spat or young oysters, or otherwise improving the oyster and mussel beds, during the twenty years that they have had that monopoly.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The area granted by the West Loch Tarbert Order amounted to 498 imperial acres. The rent paid for the last ten years has amounted to £10, and the annual rent previously was £5. The total sum paid for laying down oysters, etc., during the whole period has been £2,300.

Aberdour—Buccleugh Fisheries.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE: To ask the Secretary for Scotland with reference to both the Aberdour Fishery Order, 1870, and the Buccleugh Fishery Order, 1870, respectively, which were confirmed by the Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Confirmation Act, 1870, what is the approximate area over which the monopoly of mussel fishing is given to the undertakers; what rent they have paid; and what sums have been expended by them in laying down spat or young mussels or otherwise improving the mussel beds during the thirty-eight years that they have had that monopoly.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) In reply to the question as regards the Buccleugh Fishery Order, 1870, the approximate area included under the Order was 5,403 acres. No rent was asked by the Crown and no outlay has been made. The intention of the Order was to protect the oyster beds, which were being depleted; but I am informed that it has not had the desired effect. So far I have not been able to obtain information with reference to the Aberdour Fishery Order; but I am making inquiries.

Exclusive Oyster and Mussel Fishery Rights in Scottish Waters.

Mr. DUNDAS WHITE: To ask the Secretary for Scotland what Fishery Orders have been made under the Sea Fisheries Act, 1868, creating several and exclusive rights of oyster or mussel fishery in Scottish waters, and which of them are still in force.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Orders made are as follows:—* (1) Donibristle Oyster Fishery Order, 1869; * (2) Holy Loch Oyster and Mussel Order, 1869; (3) Aberdour (Fife) Mussel Order, 1870; (4) Buccleugh Mussel Order, 1870; * (5) Mid-Forth Oyster and Mussel Order, 1870; * (6) Edinburgh Oyster and Mussel Order, 1870; * (7) Greshernish Oyster and Mussel Order, 1872; (8) West Loch Tarbert Oyster and Mussel Order, 1887; (9) Loch Sween Oyster and Mussel Order, 1891; (10) Loch Creran Oyster and Mussel Order, 1891; * (11) Cockenzie Mussel Order, 1894.

Scottish Farmers' Co-operative Societies.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state how much was spent in 1907 by the Government in Scotland in furthering the principle of co-operation among farmers, and how many farmers' co-operative societies now exist there.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. No grants have been made by the Government for the purpose to which my hon. friend refers. The Board have no information as to the number of agricultural co-operative societies in Scotland beyond that contained in the Report for 1907 of the Scottish Agricultural Organisation Society, from which it appears that seventeen societies of that nature have been formed and affiliated to the central society.

Result of Part II of Preliminary Examination for Teachers' Certificates.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he will state the cause of the delay in issuing of Part II. of the Preliminary examination for the teachers' certificate, 1908, and the approximate date at which the results in question will be made known.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The results have been forwarded to the candidates this evening. The delay has been due to the necessity of deciding certain questions arising in connection with the new training college regulations before the lists are issued.

Petitions from Chefs de Famille of Alderney.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received a petition, forwarded to him with a covering letter dated 22nd May, from a meeting of the *Chefs de Famille* of the Island of Alderney, legally convened; and, if so, what were the contents of the petition; and if he will state the nature of the reply given to it.

MR. BOWERMAN: To ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether he has received a petition, forwarded to him with a covering letter dated 22nd May, from a meeting of the *Chefs de Famille* of the Island of Alderney, legally convened, and, if so, what were the contents of the petition; and if he will state the nature of the reply given to it.

MR. BOWERMAN: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he has received a petition, forwarded to him with a covering letter dated 22nd May, from a meeting of the *Chefs de Famille* of the Island of Alderney, legally convened; and, if so, what were the contents of the petition; and if he will state the nature of the reply given to it.

MR. BOWERMAN: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received a petition, forwarded to him with a covering letter dated 22nd May, from a meeting of the *Chefs de Famille* of the Island of Alderney, legally convened; and, if so, what were the contents of the petition; and if he will state the nature of the reply given to it.

MR. BOWERMAN: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has received a petition, forwarded to him with a covering letter dated 22nd May, from a meeting of the *Chefs de Famille* of the Island of Alderney, legally convened, and, if so, what were the contents of the petition; and if he will state the nature of the reply given to it.

---

* Determined.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I beg leave to answer these Questions. Petitions addressed to the heads of several Government Departments have been received through the Lieutenant-Governor of Guernsey. The petitioners, inhabitants and ratepayers of Alderney, were in favour of a syndicate being allowed to build an abattoir in the Island, and to import and kill cattle for the English market. This matter has been often considered, in consultation with the Board of Agriculture, and I regret that I cannot depart from the decision that the establishment of the proposed abattoir cannot be permitted.

MR. BOWERMAN: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received a petition, forwarded to him with a covering letter dated 22nd May, from a meeting of the *Chefs de Famille* of the Island of Alderney, legally convened; and, if so, what were the contents of the petition; and if he will state the nature of the reply given to it.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have not received the petition referred to.

Transfer of Licence Duties to County Council.

MR. W. JOHNSON (Warwickshire, Nuneaton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is the intention of the Government, under Clause 6 of the Finance Bill, 1908, to fix 1st January next as the date of transfer to county councils of the power to levy the duties on local taxation licences, to which Clause 6 applies; and whether, after that date, 1st January, 1909, such licences will continue to be issued by the Inland Revenue and post offices, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have appointed an inter-departmental committee to advise as to the most convenient date for the transfer. Under the arrangements contemplated, the issue of the licences in question would be confined to post offices.

Rights of Kathiawar Chiefs.

MR. E. H. LAMB (Rochester): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for India whether, in 1904, on the death of the late Khachar Shri Ala Chela, Chief of the third-class State of Jasdan, in Kathiawar, the undisputed customary law of succession was set aside and the law of primogeniture substituted, whereby two of the late chief's sons and two of his grandsons were disinherited and deprived, unheard, of their patrimony, in spite of the agreements made by Colonel Walker in 1807–1808 with the Kathiawar chiefs and confirmed by the royal proclamation of 1858; ; and, if so, what steps does he intend to take to restore to the disinherited chiefs their rights of inheritance.

(*Answered by Mr. Buchanan.*) The Queston suggests that a recognised law of succession was ignored in the settlement of the Jasdan succession, and that the settlement also was in conflict with the Queen's proclamation and the guarantee of internal sovereignty given by Colonel Walker. The real fact is that a strict adherence to the past custom in regard to Jasdan would, by dividing the small state into fragments, have defeated the liberal policy expressed in Lord Canning's Sanads as well as the guarantees given in 1807. There is a limit to the possible disintegration of internal sovereignty which would have been overpassed if, on the death of Khachar Shri Ala Chela, the sixty-two villages under his rule had been divided into four parts. To "perpetuate the Government of the chief and continue the representation and dignity of his house," in the words of Lord Canning, the Secretary of State's predecessors set aside the local custom of equal inheritance, thus maintaining an estate large enough to support internal sovereignty. The only other alternative was to allow the sub-division, and provide for the public administration under British control and the Thana system. Provision was of course made for the maintenance of the other sons and grandsons of the late chief.

Small Holding Schemes.

MR. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he would state how many acres have been provided severally in each scheme submitted to the Board; and what is the total acreage of land applied for in each of the counties which have submitted schemes.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The following Statement will show the acreage of land provided in the sixteen schemes already submitted for approval—

Name of County.	Locality.	Area of Land comprised in each Scheme. a.	r.	p.
Radnor - - - -	Cwm Farm, Llanyre -	280	0	18
Gloucester - - -	Mickleton - - -	9	1	34
„ - - -	„ - - -	46	1	7
„ - - -	Petworth - - -	87	0	36
„ - - -	Coombe Hill - - -	145	3	25
„ - - -	Clifford Chambers - -	63	1	3
„ - - -	Lower Ley Farm - -	115	1	18
Somerset - - - -	Henstridge - - -	26	2	23
Isle of Wight - - -	Northwood - - -	104	2	0
„ - - -	Whippingham - - -	38	0	15
Southampton - - -	Amport - - - -	15	1	20
Norfolk - - - -	Wick Farm, Watton -	285	0	0
„ - - - -	School Farm, Brancaster -	72	0	0
„ - - - -	Sedgeford - - -	39	0	0
„ - - - -	Carleton Rode - -	40	0	0
Cambridge - - -	Guilden Morden - -	16	3	14

The total acreage of land applied for in the counties is as follows—

Name of County.	Extent of Land for which application has been made in the County. Acres.
Radnor - - -	1,600
Gloucester - - -	9,635
Somerset - - -	23,724
Isle of Wight - -	1,837
Southampton - - -	7,380
Norfolk - - -	22,760
Cambridge - - -	10,938

Settlement of Purchase Negotiations on the Estate of Mr. D. C. O'Connell.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that proceedings have been instituted against the tenants on the estate of Mr. D. C. O'Connell, near Mastergeehy, County Kerry; and whether, in view of the fact that the tenants signed purchase agreements under misapprehension, and, on learning the exact character of the agreements, immediately repudiated them, the Estates Commissioners will use their influence to secure a settlement of the purchase negotiations.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they cannot trace any proceedings as having been instituted before them in respect of the estate mentioned in the Question, and that they have no knowledge of the matters referred to. If any application should be made to the Commissioners by either party they would, no doubt, consider whether they could usefully offer their services as conciliators under the regulations.

Amalgamations of Irish Schools.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Commissioners of National Education sanction the amalgamation of infant and senior schools in close proximity; and if such schools were amalgamated, and the principal of the infant school retained as assistant, would such assistant be guaranteed increments and promotion, and receive residual capitation grants equal to what the average would entitle the assistant to as principal of the infant school.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have sent to the hon. Member a copy of the Commissioners' regulations dealing with the matter in question.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if, where there are two adjoining schools, infant and senior, the principal of the senior school can admit children of the junior school where the parents so desire it and when there is a junior assistant to instruct them.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that they cannot answer this Question unless they are furnished with particulars of the precise case referred to.

Bureau of Commerce for Ireland.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Resolution passed at the recent Congress of the Irish Technical Instruction Association in favour of the establishment of a bureau of commerce and industry in Ireland; and whether he will consider the advisability of establishing such a bureau.

(*Answered by Mr. T. W. Russell.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. I gather from the Press Reports of the proceedings of the Irish Technical Instruction Congress that such a resolution was adopted; but it has not yet been officially communicated to the Department. The matter to which it relates has for some time past been engaging the attention of the Department.

Political Rights of Irish National School Teachers.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether there is any reason why the Irish National School teachers should not be permitted to enjoy the same political rights and privileges as the teachers in Great Britain; and, if not, whether he will consider the advisability of having these same rights and privileges extended to them.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to my Answer to the Question on this subject which was put by the hon. Member for East Kerry on 13th May, 1907. As I then indicated, the Commissioners of National Education declined, for the reasons stated, to modify their rules relating to the civil rights of teachers. The responsibility for this decision rests entirely upon the Commissioners.

Decrease of Consumption in Ireland.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state whether there has been any appreciable decrease in the number of cases of consumption in Ireland consequent on the inauguration of a national campaign against the disease; and whether he has any statement to make on the subject generally so far as Ireland was concerned.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I do not think that I can at present conveniently add anything to the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member's similar Question on 26th May last. I hope, however, to be in a position to make a statement on the subject upon the Second Reading of the Tuberculosis Prevention (Ireland) Bill.

Application of James Kenny, of Clouncon.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the Estates Commissioners inquired into the case of James Kenny, of Clouncon, Ashford, in the County of Limerick; and, if so, what action do they intend to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received their inspector's Report upon the application of James Kenny, and will consider it, with others, as soon as possible.

Provision of Boots for the Territorial Army.

Mr. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether boots are provided as part of the kit of the Territorial Army; and, if not, whether, seeing that good boots are a most important part of a soldier's equipment, he will consider the advisability of including boots in the kit provided.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This point was carefully considered when the grants for clothing and equipments were fixed, and it was held that the provision set forth in Paragraph 612 of the Regulations for the Territorial Force was sufficient to compensate men for the extra wear due to military service.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Helmsdale Harbour, Sutherland.

Mr. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether any complaint, recommendation, or suggestion has been made by the officers of His Majesty's ships of war regarding the state of the bar at Helmsdale Harbour, Sutherland; and, if so, will he press the authority to see that the channel is improved by dredging or otherwise?

The FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.): The Answer to my hon. friend's Question is in the negative.

Fife Coastguard Service.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he can give any further information as to contemplated changes in the coastguard service in Fife.

Mr. McKENNA: I have nothing to add to the reply given by the late Parliamentary Secretary on 31st March last, namely, that no changes are contemplated at present at any stations on the Fife coast.

Rosyth Harbour Works.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether orders have been given to proceed no further with the sinking of the steel caisson at Rosyth; whether it is over eighteen months since this work was begun; and why it is not being proceeded with with the utmost despatch.

Mr. McKENNA: The sinking of the experimental cylinder has been stopped because the information it was desired to obtain has been got, and there is no object in sinking it further. The work of sinking this cylinder was begun over eighteen months ago.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Is it not an advantage to use the fine weather for these maritime operations?

Mr. McKENNA: The sinking of the cylinder has been stopped.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: But if the fine weather is not made use of and you are hindered by the winter weather—which is very severe on the coast of Fife—will there not be a delay in the finishing of Rosyth?

Mr. McKENNA: Whatever the weather we do not propose to sink the cylinder any further.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: What I want to get at is whether this will not cause a delay in the formation of Rosyth Dockyard.

MR. MCKENNA: No, sir.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Can the right hon. Gentleman, who says that Rosyth Dockyard will not be made for seven years, guarantee that we shall have peace for that time?

MR. MCKENNA: All the information to be acquired by the sinking of the cylinder has been obtained, and therefore there is no need to sink it any further.

H.M.S. "Defence."

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether the new-armoured cruiser "Defence" is still detained at Pembroke; and, if so, to what cause is the detention due and when is she likely to get her crew and leave the dockyard.

MR. MCKENNA: The ship has been detained at Pembroke on account of the non-delivery of some of the capstan gear by the firm who have the contract for its supply. This gear has now been delivered, and when it has been fitted, the ship will be ready to leave Pembroke Dockyard. The crew will be available when the ship is ready.

Manning of the Navy.

MR. NIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty whether there are three new armoured ships approaching completion for which there are no crews; and whether there are more than a dozen battleships lying at the Channel ports because it has not been found possible to form crews to man them for use in the pending manœuvres or to obtain the men for the purpose.

MR. MCKENNA: Crews are ready for all armoured ships approaching completion. There are fourteen battleships in home waters not taking part in the manœuvres:—"Implacable," undergoing refit; thirteen older battleships of the "Royal Sovereign," "Renown," "Centurion," and "Trafalgar" classes, and on the special service list. These vessels are not required for the manœuvres. Should it be desirable to commission these ships, the necessary ratings for nucleus crews of active service men are available; the balance of the crews can be completed by calling out reserves.

Dissensions in the Navy.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government will devote their consideration to alleviating the dissensions among senior naval officers; and, if so, whether the Government will impartially endeavour to arrive at a complete knowledge of the method of introduction and the value of the changes in administration and organisation which originated this antagonism.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Before the Question is answered I wish to ask whether the Prime Minister is not aware that so long as dissensions exist, and so long as these gentlemen are left in command, the life of every seaman in the Fleet is imperilled.

CAPTAIN MURRAY (Kincardineshire): May I also ask whether, in the Prime Minister's opinion, the introduction by the Board of Admiralty of changes in administration and organisation, by whatever method, or however valuable or valueless these changes may be, can ever justify the display of antagonism on the part of the senior naval officers referred to in the Question?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I very much deprecate these Questions. The Government have no knowledge, apart from unverified rumours, of the dissensions alleged. If they find reason to believe that a state of things exists which is in any way detrimental to the discipline or smooth working of the fleet they will not hesitate to take prompt and effective action. As regards the latter part of the Question, I must repudiate emphatically the suggestion which it appears to convey. The direction of the naval policy of the country lies with the Government of the day, and it is the business of naval officers on active service not to discuss or criticise that policy but to carry it out with loyalty to their superiors, in harmony with one another, and with a single eye to the efficiency of the great service to which they belong.

MR. BELLAIRS: Without questioning anything the Prime Minister has said, I desire to ask whether he is aware that these dissensions extend to many senior naval officers, and that it is impossible for them to take service at the Board of Admiralty while these changes are in being without some inquiry into their justification?

MR. ASQUITH: I am not aware of anything of the kind.

Welsh and Scottish Cloth.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War on what grounds it has been stated on behalf of the War Office that better cloth is manufactured in Scotland than in Wales.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): Before the Question is answered, may I ask if the War Office authorities are aware that a kilt made from tartan manufactured in Scotland will last a lifetime, while other tartans might be in tatters in a couple of years?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. ACLAND, Yorkshire, Richmond): As there are no Welsh manufacturers on the War Office list for Highland tartan, it may fairly be inferred that this pre-eminently Scottish material is better made in Scotland than in Wales.

*MR. REES: But was not a statement made without qualification or reserve that better cloth was manufactured in Scotland than in Wales?

MR. ACLAND: I made no reflection on Welsh cloth in general. If there are any Welsh firms able to meet our special requirements we shall be delighted if the hon. Member can bring us in touch with them.

*MR. REES: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that Welsh manufacturers look on it as a very serious matter that a doubt should be expressed with regard to the superiority of the Welsh cloth?

MR. ACLAND: It is well known among cloth manufacturers that it is not a very difficult thing to get their names on the War Office list of contractors, and we are willing to give trial orders to any firm which likes to apply.

Clothing Contracts for Welsh Regiments.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether an arrangement will be made for the manufacture of uniforms for Welsh regiments in Wales, similar to that which has been made in respect to the manufacture of tartans in Scotland for Scottish regiments.

MR. ACLAND: There is no arrangement for the manufacture of Highland tartan in Scotland, but only Scottish firms appear to produce it. As I have already informed my hon. friend, should any Welsh manufacturers desire to tender for Army clothes, the War Office would be glad to receive applications.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): Will the right hon. Gentleman see that the uniforms for the Essex regiments are made in Essex?

[No Answer was returned.]

Volunteer Quartermaster-Sergeants.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether orderly-room clerks who had attained the rank of quartermaster-sergeant in the Volunteers are to be reduced in rank by reason of their having joined the Territorial Army; whether these non-commissioned officers, if they had declined to join the Territorial Army, could have retired with a higher rank than will now be the case; and whether, having regard to the desirability of encouraging enlistment in the Territorial Army, the position of these non-commissioned officers will be reconsidered

MR. ACLAND: This question is now being considered.

Scottish Tartans.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is his intention to have Scottish tartans for Highland regiments made in Wales or Scotland.

Mr. ACLAND: If any Welsh manufacturer could produce satisfactory Highland tartan there would not appear to be any reason why he should be debarred from tendering for its supply.

Special Reserve and Jury Service.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the men and non-commissioned officers of the Special Reserve are exempt from jury service and whether the officers are exempt from jury service and from having to serve as High Sheriff.

Mr. ACLAND: Non-commissioned officers and men of the Special Reserve are exempt from jury service when they are subject to military law. Officers are exempt from jury service when on full pay. Officers are not exempt from serving as High Sheriff.

South African Garrison.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether further reductions are contemplated amongst the troops in South Africa; and whether he can state what they will be and when they are to come into force.

Mr. ACLAND: Beyond those already stated—no, Sir.

Scottish Regiments in India.

Mr. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for India with reference to the use by Scottish regiments in India of Anglican churches, if he can state whether any and, if so, what steps have been taken to ascertain the feelings and wishes of the rank and file with regard to the recent order that these regiments shall only be quartered where Presbyterians places of worship exist; and if, in the case of its being ascertained that the wishes of a regiment are averse to this proposition, the order in such a case would be inoperative.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.): No special steps have been taken for ascertaining the feelings and wishes of the rank and file of Scottish regiments on the question referred to by my hon. friend.

Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): Does the right hon. Gentleman consider that full advantage can be taken of the Scottish regiments in India, when their disposition is regulated by religious conviction?

Mr. BUCHANAN: I think the disposition of the Scottish regiments in India is a matter within the discretion of the military authorities.

The D'Angely Case.

Mr. RENDALL (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the proprietors of the *Daily Mail* have yet communicated to the Home Office their intention of making good to the police officers concerned in the D'Angely case the cost of their defence before the Commission; and whether, if the proprietors make an offer of adequate financial reparation for the wrong done by them, he will be willing to accept it on behalf of the police officers concerned.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds): As regards the first part of the Question, no expense was incurred by individual police officers in defending themselves before the Royal Commission. The second is a hypothetical question, which I cannot undertake to answer now.

Mr. RENDALL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what the recent Police Commission has cost the taxpayers; and what, if any, contribution has been or will be made by the Exchequer towards the expenses of police officers in defending themselves from the attacks of the *Daily Mail* and others held by the Commission to be untrue in fact.

MR. GLADSTONE: All the expense incurred in connection with the Royal Commission have fallen upon the Exchequer, or upon the Police Fund. No portion of them has fallen upon individual police officers. I am unable at present to say what the total cost will be.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the proprietors of the *Daily Mail* sent 670 reply paid telegrams to Members of this House the other day and that scarcely any of them were used? Will he consider the advisability of making some allowance——

*MR. SPEAKER: That hardly arises out of the Question.

Woolfardisworthy Postal Arrangements.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that in certain portions of the parish of Woolfardisworthy, in North Devon, there is a delivery of letters on three days a week only; whether he is aware that loss and inconvenience results to the inhabitants of these districts owing to the lack of a daily delivery; and whether he can see his way to establish a reasonably efficient postal service in this neighbourhood.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I have called for a report on this subject; and on its receipt I will send the hon. Member a reply.

Aberdeen Postal Arrangements.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that the postal re-arrangements in Aberdeen, necessitated by the opening of the new post office, have now been some time in operation, he will cause inquiries to be made before the autumn session, and before the framing of next year's Estimates, with a view to securing for Woodside district an evening postal service as in other parts of the city, and also as to the desirability of complying with a petition sent praying for the establishment of a sub-post office near the Spital to supply a much needed and increasing demand.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The application for the establishment of a sub-post office near the Spital, Aberdeen, was duly considered, but as there is already a sub-post office less than 400 yards from the suggested site and a letter-box about 185 yards, the existing facilities appear to be adequate for the present requirements of the public in the locality. As regards Woodside, the amount of correspondence appears to be hardly sufficient to justify the establishment of an evening delivery in that district, but I will further inquire into the question.

French Tariff.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY (Middlesex, Hornsey): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the proposed alterations in the French tariff include proposals for the decrease of the duty upon india-rubber thread, and for the increase of the duty upon articles manufactured from india-rubber thread, such as elastic cloth, garters, suspenders, etc.; and, if so, to what extent.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Sir H. KEARLEY, Devonport): The Board of Trade are endeavouring to obtain more precise information as to the nature of the proposals to which the noble Lord refers. I am at present unable to give a definite Answer.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: Do the Government propose to take any steps to obviate the injury which will be inflicted on British manufacturers by this change if it is carried into effect?

[No Answer was returned.]

Welsh University Grant.

SIR D. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he has yet received the Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire and report on the question of increased grants to the three constituent colleges of the University of Wales, and, if not, can he state when he expects that the Report will be presented.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The Report has just been received, and is now under consideration.

American Beef Firms and Income-Tax.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Income-Tax Commissioners in Liverpool have reported that an examination of the books of some of the firms comprised in what is known as the American Beef Trust disclosed no profits, the cattle and beef being invoiced to the branches of those firms in Great Britain at prices leaving no margin of profit liable to income-tax; whether any of the firms belonging to the Trust pay income-tax upon the trade done in this country; and, if not, whether any steps will be taken to prevent a continuance of such evasion of taxation.

MR. HOBHOUSE: My right hon. friend has caused careful inquiry to be made into the matter referred to by the hon. Member, but is unable to obtain any confirmation of the suggestion made in the question. The Commissioners of Taxes at Liverpool bring into charge all American companies and firms trading there, and the liability to income-tax of these traders is ascertained as far as possible on the exact profits, *i.e.*, the difference between the proved cost price in America and the sale price in this country, less cost of freight and distribution expenses.

Margarine.

EARL OF RONALDSHAY: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether nut butters, manufactured entirely from nuts and not containing a particle of animal fat, have been allowed to be described by the authorities as margarine; and, if so, under what statutory provision this has been done.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): Perhaps the noble Lord will allow me to refer him to my reply to a similar Question by my hon. friend the Member for West Bradford on 15th June.

Balintore Harbour, Ross-shire.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that the trustees of Balintore Harbour, Ross-shire, have no funds at their command with which to place the harbour in a state of repair, will the Fishery Board make a grant for this purpose.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The Board have no power to use the funds placed at their disposal for piers and harbours in meeting the cost of maintaining harbours.

Sanitation in the Hebrides.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will consider the expediency of deputing instructors in sanitary science to visit the townships in the Islands of Lewis and the other islands in the Hebrides, in order that the people may have explained to them some of the primary sanitary principles such as may be conducive to an improvement in the sanitary conditions of the townships.

*MR. REES: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will consider the peculiar fitness for this function of the medical officer for Colwyn Bay?

MR. SINCLAIR: As my hon. friend knows, the local public health authority in the Lewis have at present no margin of funds upon which any further charge can be laid for this or indeed any other purpose.

Rate Arrears in Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the amount of grants, in respect of rates in arrear, made by the Government to the landlord of the Island of Lewis and the tenants respectively.

MR. SINCLAIR: No grants of the kind referred to by my hon. friend have been made.

MR. WEIR: But the right hon. Gentleman said the other day he had authorised certain payments in advance of the grant-in-aid.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the amount of arrears of rates due by the landlord of the Island of Lewis on 31st March last, and the amount of arrears due from tenants paying over £30 and under £30 respectively.

MR. SINCLAIR: I learn on inquiry that the parish council books are now with the auditors and it has consequently not been possible to obtain the information desired by my hon. friend.

MR. WEIR: Can it be done in the course of a fortnight?

MR. SINCLAIR: I will do my best.

MR. WEIR: Very well. I will then put another Question down.

Congestion in the Island of Lewis.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland in view of the fact that the arrears of judicial rents due from crofters in the Island of Lewis are attributable to their having to bear the burden of 1,500 cotters and squatters located on their lands, and that the Scottish Office in February, 1904, expressed the opinion that the cottar difficulty might be met by a scheme of voluntary migration to the mainland, will he state whether there is any probability of some such scheme being promulgated during the present session of Parliament.

MR. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend misapprehends somewhat the position of this matter. In 1904 the Secretary for Scotland, so far as I can ascertain, did not, as my hon. friend has repeatedly alleged in Questions upon the Paper of this House, indicate that the only way of dealing with the congestion of population in the Lewis was by a scheme of voluntary migration; what he wrote was: "The Congested Districts Board will endeavour effectually to deal with any applications they may receive for the voluntary migration from the Lewis of cottars and others now unable to find a decent livelihood in their present position." My hon. friend sent me a list of the names of 121 such persons lately lodged with the Landward Committee. Before the Board could take any action further information was necessary as to the skill and experience of applicants, and also as to their ability to rent stock and cultivate holdings. On 17th March the Landward Committee of the Parish Council of Stornaway was asked by the Congested Districts Board to furnish this information, and I understand that they are now endeavouring to obtain it. No further steps can be taken until it is forthcoming. I must remind my hon. friend that owing to its great difficulties no scheme of this kind has yet been found practicable. The Congested Districts Board have no land of their own upon which such migrants, even if qualified in all respects, can be settled; and they have not succeeded in obtaining any openings of this kind for such migrants upon the lands of other proprietors. Under these circumstances my hon. friend must judge for himself whether there is any probability of any such scheme being promulgated during the present session of Parliament

County of Sutherland Education Grant.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can give the details of the grants that go to make up the sum of £2,400, said to be at present received by the county of Sutherland, which, under Clause 13 of the Education (Scotland) Bill, constitute the Education (Scotland) Fund.

MR. SINCLAIR: It does not seem necessary to give the details of these grants in the case of every single district. If the hon. Member has any reason to suppose that the amount of grant at present received by the County of Sutherland as stated in the Return is inaccurate, the Department will give full consideration to any statement of particulars bearing upon the point which he way furnish.

Highland Medical Officer of Health.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state under what circumstances the appointment of medical officer of health has been conferred in four cases in the Highland crofting counties of officers who do not possess a diploma in sanitary science, as required under Section 54 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889.

MR. SINCLAIR: One medical man holds two of the four appointments referred to, so that in three cases the salaries were sanctioned on condition that the medical officer of health should take the diploma in terms of Section 54 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889. In regard to the fourth appointment it was given to the county medical officer of the district who was appointed before such a qualification was necessary. It is understood that in none of these cases were the services of a qualified practitioner available.

Discussion of Scottish Estimates.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will consent to a Return showing the last dates on which the votes were passed, after discussion in this House, in the case of each of the following Scottish Votes: Lunacy Commission, Registrar General's Office, Register House, Prisons Commission, National Galleries Board, Crofters Commission, Congested Districts Boards, Law Charges and Courts of Law, Public Education, Scotland, and the number of days or parts of a day given to the actual discussion of Scottish Estimates during each of the last ten years, and the annual average number of Parliamentary hours during the last twenty years.

MR. SINCLAIR: With regard to the information required in the first portion of my hon. friend's Question a Return does not appear necessary as that information is equally available to my hon. friend as it is to the Scottish Office. With regard to the information required in the second part of the Question, a Return is not possible as the authorities of this House are unable to furnish the full information required. The number of whole days occupied in discussion will be found in the Journals of the House and in *Hansard*.

MR. PIRIE: Does not the right hon. Gentleman realise that I want this, not for my personal information, but for the information of the public of Scotland?

MR. SINCLAIR: And the information is perfectly accessible to the public of Scotland.

MR. PIRIE: But the right hon. Gentleman has said there are no official sources available. Will he reconsider his decision, and give me this information for the people of Scotland. It is most important.

MR. SINCLAIR: I shall be very glad to consider any further representations sent to me.

MR. PIRIE: And I will repeat the Question until I get the information desired.

Afforestation in Scotland.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state how much money has been spent during the present year upon afforestation at Inverliever; what staff is at present engaged there; what Department controls their work; and what is the total estimated outlay during 1908–1909.

MR. HOBHOUSE: I understand that no money has been spent up to date on afforestation, as operations have not been commenced. A forester has been appointed and is resident on the estate. The necessary arrangements are now being made for housing a staff of some eight men so as to begin planting operations next autumn. The Commissioners of Woods, advised by their Chief Consulting Forest Officer, control the work. It is impossible at present to forecast the total outlay during 1908–1909, but it is hoped to plant up about 100 acres.

LORD BALCARRES: What experience has the Woods and Forests Department of afforestation on the sea-board line of Scotland, where there is a rainfall of seventy inches?

MR. HOBHOUSE: I suppose as much experience as any other public department.

*LORD BALCARRES: Has the Scottish Office no control over this afforestation in Scotland?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: I speak with but a limited knowledge of the Woods and Forests Department. It is only indirectly under the Treasury. But they own this land, and they have very large experience of planting in England and some in Wales, where the rainfall is quite as heavy as in Scotland.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: And are only nine men to be employed?

Mr. HOBHOUSE: At present.

New Fishery Cruiser.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is yet able to afford any information with regard to the new fishery cruiser.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I regret that I am not in a position to add to the replies I have already given to the hon. Member.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I will repeat the Question this day week.

Gooseberry Mildew.

Mr. GWYNN (Galway): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture (Ireland) what steps have been taken under the Order of 1908 against the American gooseberry mildew; what acreage of gooseberry bushes is affected by the pest; and in how many cases definite action has been taken.

The VICE-PRESIDENT of the DEPARTMENT of AGRICULTURE for IRELAND (Mr. T. W. Russell, Tyrone, E.): The Department's horticultural experts (as well as the itinerant instructors in horticulture employed by the county committees of agriculture) have been instructed to carry out inspections of gardens throughout the country with a view to reporting on outbreaks of American gooseberry mildew. This work is being proceeded with at present, but the Department are not yet in a position to state definitely what areas are affected by the disease. In 125 cases in which the existence of the disease has been reported to the Department, notices requiring the destruction of the diseased bushes have been issued to the owners under Clause 4 (2) of the American Gooseberry Mildew (and Black Currant Mite (Ireland)) Order, 1908. Notices have also been served on fifty-eight persons owning gardens to which it was considered the disease was likely to spread owing to their proximity to affected gardens, requiring them as a preventive measure to spray their bushes (with an approved fungicide). Arrangements have been made for the inspection of gooseberries exposed for sale in fruit markets, and one consignment containing diseased berries was recently condemned in the Dublin market and the berries destroyed.

Land Purchase Annuities Arrears.

Mr. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the figures as to arrears of tenant-purchasers' annuities under the Purchase Act of 1903 and the previous Purchase Acts cannot be procured without difficulty by the Estates Commissioners; is it a fact that the arrears under all the Acts are inconsiderable and that they are even less under the Act of 1903 than under the previous Acts; and whether, in view of the forthcoming measure to provide funds for the payment of the £40,000,000 worth of land now outstanding, he will publish these figures without delay, as the best proof that advances under this Act are not attended with any loss or danger to the Imperial taxpayer.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange): The Land Commission have furnished me with the information asked for by the hon. Member, in advance of their annual Report, which will shortly be published. There are in all 116,992 payers of annuities under the three sets of Land Purchase Acts, and the total amount payable is £1,448,991. On 1st instant 1,013 payers were in arrear, to the amount of £9,132, in respect of annuities due up to the end of last year. I will circulate with to-night's Votes a tabular statement showing separately and in detail the arrears under the different sets of Land Purchase Acts. It is the fact, as suggested by the hon. Member, that the annuities under all the Acts have been very well paid, and that the arrears under the Act of 1903 are proportionately somewhat smaller than those under the earlier Acts.

Irish Development Grant.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the reasons for the alterations contained in the revised Estimate for the Ireland Development Grant.

MR. CHERRY: In the estimate for the Ireland Development Grant which was prepared early in December last the estimated balance to the credit of the account on 1st April, 1908, was shown to be £91,538. In May last, when the account for the year ending 31st March, 1908, was made up, it was found that the actual balance in hand was but £51,135. The difference arose mainly from the fact that in the last quarter of the financial year claims amounting to £37,031 were received from the Commissioners of National Education on account of training colleges under private management, and salaries of assistant teachers in national schools which had not been taken into account in estimating the balance in December. It therefore became necessary to prepare a revised Estimate for the current year, showing proposed expenditure at the reduced total of £236,477. The subheads of the Estimate in which a reduction has been made are as follows:—Subhead C. (National School Buildings)—£25,000, being an instalment of a grant of £70,000, reduced to £5,000, on the understanding that the balance of the £70,000 will be made available in future years, and that the unexpended balance of £35,455 on Vote 14, Class I. for 1907–8 will be available to meet expenditure on school buildings in the current year. Subhead H. (Newry, Keady, and Tynan Railway).—It is doubtful whether the promoters of this railway will be in a posision to make good their claim to any portion of the promised grant. Provision is made for £2,318 instead of £23,950. Subhead K. (Arklow Harbour).—Grant reduced from £10,362 to £8,000, the latter sum being now considered sufficient to meet expenditure during the year. In the case of two of the subheads, the provision has been somewhat increased as compared with the first estimate, namely:—Subhead B. (Marlborough Street Training College).—Grant increased from £2,792 to £4,277, the latter being the actual balance unexpended of the total grant of £50,000. Subhead L. (Wicklow Harbour).—Grant increased from £1,536 to £3,822, the latter being the actual balance of the complete grant. The work is appoaching completion.

Fuel for Irish Schools.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the total amounts expended by national school teachers in providing fuel, paying for repairs, etc., for their schools during the year ending 31st March, 1908; and if he will direct the National Board to insert in the quarterly Returns the amounts expended by teachers on fuel, upkeep, and repairs in national schools.

MR. CHERRY: The Commissioners of National Education have no information as to the amounts which may have been expended by teachers upon fuel for, and repairs of their schools. It would not be appropriate to include particulars of the kind in the quarterly Return, which relates to the payment of salaries, but the Commissioners will consider whether the information could properly be included in the annual statistical return.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire what would be the total cost of supplying fuel to all the national schools in Ireland?

MR. CHERRY: I should like notice of that Question.

Galway Poor Rate Collector.

MR. GWYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why the Local Government Board has refused its consent to the resolution of the urban district council of Galway reducing the poundage fees of their poor rate collector; whether his attention has been called to the fact that the increase in the poor rate, occasioned by distress in the town, has raised the collector's salary to a point which it never previously reached; and whether the Board will reconsider their action in the interest of economy of administration.

Mr. CHERRY: The poor rate collector referred to was appointed in 1904, at a poundage fee of 10d., and in 1905, the urban district council, by a large majority, increased the poundage rate to 1s., with the sanction of the Local Government Board. The facts upon which the council based their proposal for the increase in 1905 do not appear to have altered in any respect, and the Local Government Board, therefore, see no reason for assenting to the proposed reduction of the poundage fees. The amount to be collected for the present year is £7,013, which is but very slightly in excess of the amounts for 1903–4 and for 1906–7. The amount varies from year to year. Last year it was considerably below the average, and this year it is somewhat above the average.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that since the passing of the Local Government Act of 1898, the officials of the central authority have done all they could to increase the expenditure of the local authorities? Will he not allow the local authorities to exercise their own discretion in the practice of economy?

Mr. CHERRY: The increase in this case was made at the instance of a large majority of the members of the district council.

Cattle-Driving in Ireland.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state why, having regard to the fact that the number of cases of cattle-driving for the six months ending 27th June was 413, as compared with 381 cases for the whole of 1907, no charges arising out of these proceedings have been presented for trial at the recent summer assizes.

Mr. CHERRY: The cases of cattle-driving which occurred in the six months referred to, though more in number were less serious in character than those in the corresponding period of last year. In every case in which the police have been able to obtain evidence of participation in cattle-driving against any individuals proceedings have been taken. The question whether the cases should be dealt with summarily or returned for trial is one to be determined according to the circumstances of each case, and the Government consider that proceedings of a summary nature are as a general rule more effectual in the preservation of peace and good order in the various counties than prosecutions at the assizes would be.

Mr. LONSDALE: But do not the facts show that "binding over" is no deterrent?

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) asked the right hon. Gentleman how he differentiated cattle-driving and made out that one kind was less serious than another.

Mr. CHERRY replied that the circumstances of cases differed. It was a serious case when a large crowd assembled, intimidation was indulged in, and persons were injured, but when one or two men did no more than secretly at night open a gate to let the cattle out, it was not so serious.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG asked whether the failure of the police to obtain evidence was not due to the fact that the unfortunate owners of cattle had come to the conclusion that the Government were unwilling any longer to protect them?

[No Answer was returned.]

Crime in Clare.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the remarks of the Lord Chief Baron in opening the Clare Assizes on Thursday, that the state of the county was lamentable, that the number of cases specially reported as outrages since the last assizes in March were as many as ninety-nine, seventy-four of which were agrarian, that there were under constant police protection five persons, and as many as sixty-five were protected by patrol, and that there had been since the March Assizes forty-eight cattle-drives; and whether he can state why, having regard to these facts, so few cases were presented for trial at these assizes.

Mr. CHERRY: My right hon. friend's attention has been called to a newspaper report of the remarks attributed to the Lord Chief Baron as stated in the Question. It is true that the county of Clare is in an unsatisfactory condition. An additional force of fifty-seven police has been appointed to the county under proclamation, and all possible measures are being taken under the ordinary law for the preservation of the peace and the punishment of offenders. The comparative fewness of the cases for trial was due to the fact that evidence against offenders was not forthcoming, but in this respect the state of the county is neither better nor worse than it has been for many years.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) asked whether any of the cases referred to by the Lord Chief Baron were agrarian cases, and whether in any one of the seventy-four cases referred to in the Question any person was put on his trial.

Mr. CHERRY said he thought some were agrarian. In one case certainly a man was convicted and sent to penal servitude.

Mr. LONSDALE: Does the right hon. Gentleman now admit that trial by jury has completely failed to get convictions?

Mr. CHERRY: No, Sir, certainly not.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND, as Member for the constituency, asked whether it was not the fact that a large number of the occurrences reported as outrages were of an extremely trivial character which in England would not be ranked or reported as outrages at all; and whether any unrest that existed in Clare was not entirely traceable to the fact that land purchase, for some cause or another, was not proceeding there as in other parts of Ireland.

Mr. CHERRY said that, so far as he knew, a number of the cases were trifling; but, on the other hand, there were undoubtedly some serious cases. Whether the condition of the county was due to land purchase not proceeding as rapidly there as in other parts, he did not know; but it was extremely probable.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND asked whether, in view of the undoubted fact that many of these occurrences were of a trivial character, some arrangement could not be made by the Government or others to analyse these occurences, so that the people of England might see they were by no means serious. Was it not a case of giving a dog a bad name?

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG asked what ground the right hon. Gentleman had for saying that a number of these occurrences were of a trifling nature. Had he any specific information from the county inspector or the Judge of assizes?

Mr. CHERRY: These cases regularly come before me, and I suppose I can judge for myself whether or not they are trivial. That is my opinion, but I do not know whether other people accept it.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: They ought to accept mine.

Fermoy Council Meetings.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why legal proceedings have been instituted by Mr. Anthony Carroll, Crown Solicitor, to compel the urban council of Fermoy to surrender their right to hold meetings in the court-house for the transaction of the ratepayers' business, which they have exercised and enjoyed for 100 years, seeing that the right in question was conferred upon the local authority by an Act passed in the year 1808.

Mr. CHERRY: No proceedings in this case have been instituted by Mr. Carroll as Crown Solicitor on behalf of the Government. The court-house is in the custody and control of the High Sheriff, who, I understand, has instructed his solicitor, Mr. Carroll, to apply for an injunction against the further use of the court-house by the urban district council, unless that body confines its use of the building to the proper business of the council. The Lord-Lieutenant has received from the urban district council a memorial on the subject which is now under consideration.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: Has the right hon. Gentleman referred to the Act of 1808 which gives the council an undoubted right?

Mr. CHERRY: Whatever right the council has in law can be asserted when proceedings are taken. It would not be proper for me to express any opinion while litigation is pending.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.): Seeing that this right has been exercised for 100 years, is it correct to say it is only enjoyed on sufferance as is done in the letter of the Crown Prosecutor for the county?

Mr. CHERRY: In this case the Crown Prosecutor is acting as private solicitor to the High Sheriff, and like other solicitors he may have slightly over-stated his client's case. But this is a matter to be determined by the Court.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: Who is paying the costs of the Crown Solicitor in this case?

Mr. CHERRY: I presume the High Sheriff.

Crime in Leitrim.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the statement of Mr. Justice Kenny, at the Leitrim Assizes on Friday, that there had been an increase in the number of specially reported cases since the holding of the spring assizes, that seven persons in the county were under police protection, and fifteen were still boycotted; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

Mr. CHERRY: The total number of serious offences in County Leitrim for the period referred to was fifteen, as compared with twelve in the corresponding period of last year. The police authorities inform me that this appears to be an ordinary fluctuation. Of the seven persons under police protection, four are protected by occasional patrols only; and the fifteen cases of boycotting do not now include any serious case of boycotting. The police authorities consider that on the whole the state of the county has improved. No special action is called for.

Mr. LONSDALE: Does the right hon. Gentleman say that the statement of the Judge is not in accordance with fact?

Mr. CHERRY: I should not like to express any opinion.

Crime in Longford.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Justice Madden, at the Longford Assizes, was not furnished with the detailed information on the condition of the county which is usually furnished on these occasions; whether he can state the reason for the omission; whether he is aware that the learned Judge stated on the occasion that the crime of boycotting and the form of intimidation known as cattle-driving existed in the county to an extent which led to the conclusion that its condition was other than satisfactory, and, inasmuch as offenders were not made amenable to the law, he could not regard the light calendar as fairly representative of the general condition of the county with regard to crime; and whether he intends to take any action in the matter.

Mr. CHERRY: I am informed that the learned Judge was supplied with the full returns of crime for the county in the usual form, and that, in accordance with the established practice, the county inspector was present to afford any explanation of the returns which the learned Judge might require. It is the fact that some boycotting exists in County Longford. The police are affording all necessary protection to the persons affected. There have been comparatively few cases of cattle-driving in the county, and the returns of crime show some decrease. The police authorities are of opinion that the condition of the county has somewhat improved, and no special action appears to be called for.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: When the opinion of the Judge of Assize and that of the police conflict as to whether a county is in a peaceful condition, why does the right hon. Gentleman always take the opinion of the police?

Mr. CHERRY: I do not take the opinion of the police.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: But you have in this case.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Is it not a fact that some boycotting exists in the House of Commons? Is not the hon. Member for West Belfast boycotted in this House, and was not the noble Lord the late Member for West Down boycotted out of his constituency?

Captain DONELAN: I have been the victim of boycotting myself. Does not Justice Madden speak of boycotting as a crime? Is that so termed in Irish police reports?

Mr. CHERRY: No doubt there are cases which cannot properly be classed as crimes.

Feenagh Evicted Tenant.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say on what grounds the Estates Commissioners refuse to entertain the case of James Murphy, of Croughteeri, near Feenagh, in the County of Limerick, who was evicted from his small holding by Deane Shelton, of Rossmore, for non-payment of rent.

Mr. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners, in the exercise of the discretion vested in them by Parliament, have declined, after due inquiry, to take any action upon the application in question, and they cannot undertake to state the reasons which actuate them in the exercise of such discretion.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Was not this poor man evicted for non-payment of rent? Why is a distinction drawn in his case?

Mr. CHERRY: I really cannot say. There are a great many cases of people evicted for non-payment of rent and only a small proportion can be dealt with by the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Can the right hon. Gentleman not hold out some hope to this poor man that if he cannot be reinstated he shall be given another holding?

Mr. CHERRY: The hon. Member can lay his case before the Estates Commissioners.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I have done so.

Mr. CHERRY: I should not like to interfere with their discretion.

Irish Land Stock.

Mr. GEORGE D. FABER (York): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the total issue of Guaranteed 2¾ per cent. Irish Land Stock, exclusive of the pending issue of £5,000,000, and how much of such stock is held by the National Debt Commissioners for the Savings Bank Fund; how much cash is now lent by the National Debt Commissioners, out of cash balances in their hands, to the Irish Land Purchase Fund, and will such advances be repaid out of the new issue of £5,000,000; what is the total amount now required to pay out landlords, the sale of whose estates has been sanctioned by the Estates Commissioners; what is the total amount of the deficiency in respect of the issue at a discount of Irish Land Stock; and by what total amount has the income derived from tenants' purchase annuities failed to meet the dividends payable on the Land Stock and the interest on money borrowed from the National Debt Commissioners.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The total amount of Guaranteed 2¾ per cent Stock issued prior to the recent issue of £5,000,000, was £28,201,444; of which the National Debt Commissioners hold on account of Savings Banks Funds, £7,912,893. The National Debt Commissioners have advanced to the Irish Land Purchase Fund in cash, £1,197,000, which amount will be repaid out of the proceeds of the new issue of Stock in accordance with Section 30 of the Irish Land Act, 1903. My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary informs me as regards the third part of the Question, that the Estates Commissioners have sanctioned advances in the case of direct sales amounting to £1,013,851, of which £272,249 will be advanced to-morrow and the remainder as soon as outstanding questions have been disposed of. Under Sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Irish Land Act, 1903, the Commissioners have agreed to buy estates, the purchase money of which amounts to £675,766. Of this sum £8,230 is to be advanced to-morrow and the remainder as soon as vendors have shown title, and are in a position to allocate the purchase money. The £28,201,444 stock issued produced in cash £24,862,297, or a deficiency when compared with the nominal amount of stock of £3,339,147. Of this last sum £3,020,463 will be made good by an annuity of 3¼ per cent. chargeable on the Ireland Development Grant, and the balance of £318,684 by the annuity charged on the Votes in respect of the Land Purchase Aid Fund. Since 1st November, 1903, the interest received on the Irish Land Purchase Fund in respect of tenants' purchase annuities and temporary investments has fallen short of the interest paid on stock and temporary borrowings by £161,062, of which £101,521 was charged against the £200,000 grant to the Fund under Section 38 of the Act, and the balance of £59,541 has been received from the Guarantee Fund.

Bank of Ireland.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state the grounds on which he has come to the conclusion that no change should be made in the relations of the Government with the Bank of Ireland, in which the Government accounts are kept and of which the late Treasury Remembrancer in Dublin Castle became a director while still holding that office, and which is given a preference in dealings by the Government to other banking institutions in Ireland, regard being had to the decision in the action of Alderman Corrigan against Mr. Edward R. Read, the Chairman of the late National Assurance Company of Ireland, which was heard in Dublin before Mr. Justice Andrews and a special jury, and to the fact that the National Assurance Company was accommodated by overdrafts up to £90,000 by the Bank of Ireland, by which the directors were enabled to conceal its true position and to postpone its winding-up, to the ruin of the shareholders; and if he will say whether he has considered the effect likely to be produced on public confidence in commercial probity by revelations of so grave a character making no alteration in the attitude of the Government to the Bank of Ireland, as a favoured institution for Government accounts or business.

MR. HOBHOUSE: My right hon. friend has nothing to add to his previous answer on this question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I will repeat the Question to-morrow, when I may be face to face with the right hon. Gentleman.

Telegraphic Address—"O'Connor, Foynes."

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to a complaint made by Mr. Robert Gibson, butter merchant, of Limerick, that on Friday last he sent a telegram and prepaid for reply to the village of Foynes, County Limerick, addressed to O'Connor, Foynes, asking to have half a ton of ice forwarded on the same date, and that it was notified to Mr. Gibson some two hours later that the address was insufficient, and that, having wired again, he was informed that it was then too late to have the ice forwarded on that day; and whether seeing that O'Connor is the only person who deals in ice in this small village, so that the address should have found him in the first instance, he will have the matter inquired into with a view of putting a stop to this annoyance and damage to traders.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The matter appears to be one which should be dealt with locally.

Mr. JOYCE: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that it is dealt with locally?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: No doubt now complaint has been made the postmaster will deal with it.

Mr. NIELD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that similar complaints have been made in various large centres throughout the country?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: That is a general question. In this case the telegram was simply addressed "O'Connor, Foynes," and I have little doubt from my knowledge of Ireland that there is more than one O'Connor there.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Foynes is only a small place, and that there is only one O'Connor there who sells ice? There would, therefore, have been no difficulty in finding him.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he was afraid his knowledge was not sufficiently extensive to enable him to answer that Question.

Electoral Reform

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Bill dealing with electoral reform, to be introduced during the present Parliament, will include due provision for a second ballot; or whether the Government will give special facilities to private Bills dealing with this subject.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am not in a position to indicate the provision of the Bill to which my hon friend refers; but he may be assured that the Government will, so far as is practicable, take full account of the flaws and anomalies of our electoral system with a view to their rectification.

The Beef Trust.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the allegations made by responsible persons that the beef supply of this country is controlled by foreign capitalists, he will consent to the appointment of a Select Committee of this House to inquire into the whole Question.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am not aware of the names of the responsible persons to whom the noble Lord refers. As at present advised, and without in any degree underrating the importance of the matter to which the noble Lord calls my attention, I am disposed to doubt whether an inquiry such as he suggests would be productive of useful results. I would suggest that in the first instance the noble Lord and others who may be in possession of information as to the control of our beef supply should communicate with the Departments concerned.

Lord R. CECIL: Which Departments?

Mr. ASQUITH: The Board of Agriculture and the Board of Trade.

Ancient Monuments in Wales.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he has under consideration the desirability of appointing an Archæological Commission to report upon the preservation of the ancient monuments and buildings in Wales.

Mr. ASQUITH: Yes, Sir, and I have informed my hon. friend the Member for the Carmarthen Boroughs that His Majesty's Government propose to appoint such a Commission.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: When will the Commission be appointed?

Mr. ASQUITH: That I cannot say.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Will it be this year?

Mr. ASQUITH: I hope so.

Irish Supply.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can fix another day for the consideration of Irish Estimates in Committee of Supply; and whether he will put down as first Order for that day the Vote for the Chief Secretary's salary.

MR. ASQUITH: I regret that I cannot at present fix another day for the consideration of Irish Estimates.

MR. LONSDALE: Why do the Government show such remarkable reluctance to discuss this Vote?

MR. ASQUITH: We show no reluctance.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: In view of the fact that the condition of Ireland, as regards cattle-driving, is growing steadily worse——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is now completely contradicting the statement made by the Attorney-General.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I certainly do contradict it.

Alleged Foreign Espionage.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government Departments concerned are causing inquiry to be made as to the reports of foreign espionage in various counties in England; and, if, in view of the fact that the Secretary of State for War has confessed his inability to deal with such a state of affairs, if proved to be true, by any existing law, he will consider the necessity of introducing the necessary legislation.

MR. ASQUITH: The Government Departments concerned keep themselves as fully informed in regard to this matter as the nature of the case will allow. I am not, as at present advised, of opinion that any fresh legislation is either necessary or practicable.

Army Votes.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can yet say when Army Vote 12 will be taken.

MR. ASQUITH: The Government hope to find another half day for the discussion of Army Votes; but I cannot yet say what particular Votes will be discussed.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's): I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not forget we are anxious to discuss the Special Reserve.

Appointment of Lords-Lieutenant.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is to be the custom that Lords-Lieutenant shall be appointed solely for political reasons; and whether, seeing that by statute the Lords-Lieutenant of counties are the presidents of the Associations, it is under these circumstances possible that the formation of the Territorial Army can be conducted on non-party lines.

MR. ASQUITH: It has been for a long time the custom that Lords-Lieutenant should as a rule be selected from among supporters of the Government of the day. The new duties cast upon Lords-Lieutenant in regard to the Territorial Army ought to be, and I have no doubt will be now, kept in view in any such appointments, but it must not be forgotten that Lords-Lieutenant have other and equally important functions to discharge.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Was it absolutely for political purposes that the Duke of Devonshire, a Member of the late Government, was appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Derbyshire? Is he to be considered a supporter of the present Government?

[No Answer was returned.]

Daylight Saving Bill.

MR. DUNDAS WHITE (Dumbarton shire): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government will give facilities for the passing this session of the Daylight Saving Bill, now entitled the Local Time (Great Britain and Ireland) Bill; and, if so, whether the Government will propose amendments making clear that the adoption of the proposed modification of time is not compulsory, and substituting for the term local time some less ambiguous term.

MR. ASQUITH: No, Sir. The Government have no intention of giving facilities for the passing of the Daylight Saving Bill.

IRISH UNIVERSITIES BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee C.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 219.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 219.]

Bill, as amended (by the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Thursday, 16th July, and to be printed. [Bill 306.]

SUPPLY [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1908-9.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £167,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of Educational Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909."

*MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars) said he rose to move a Resolution in his name, or rather one of two in his name. He was told he could not move to reduce the salary of the First Lord on this Vote, but to reduce the Vote, which he now did. He hoped he would be able to show that the system of training which had been introduced into the Navy, and was covered by this Vote, was a system which was costly to the nation, and to the parents and guardians of the students, that it was undemocratic, and therefore inefficient. He had no desire to speak about naval ratings generally, or the changes which had been made in the Navy consequent upon the change from sail to steam, for they were outside the scope of this Motion. Neither did he want to go into the matter which had been alluded to as to troubles in high places in the Navy, although he believed this particular scheme had contributed somewhat to them. He did not suggest for a moment that anything of that kind could justify those troubles, and he cordially echoed the evident sense of the House as shown at Question-time that some steps might be taken or means found whereby that sense of discipline and loyalty which was so necessary in all grades, and most of all at the top, should be somehow reintroduced into the Navy. He regretted that matters of naval administration should be left so much to the experts. He agreed that the expert was a valuable man, and in his own particular sphere they ought to have great respect for his opinion, but this Vote covered a matter which he submitted was of infinitely greater importance; it covered the *personnel* of the Navy, and however important it might be to have good ships and good guns, and a well-equipped Navy, after all, the men of the Navy were the most important factor; and as to the conditions necessary for the training of a proper staff in the Navy, he submitted that the House was not only quite as competent to form a judgment as the expert, but, having regard to the fact that hon. Members had come into contact with all phases of life more or less outside the Navy, they were even more competent to form a judgment than the expert. The scheme to which he took exception was a scheme for what was called the interchangeability of officers, a scheme which they were told had for its object the training of officers to be admirals and engineers, either or both, and also the training of a special class of men called mechanicians for the displacement of another class called artificers, who up to now had been obtained from the workshops of the country, and, so far as he knew, had satisfactorily performed their duties. The scheme covered five ratings in the Navy—the executive officers, the marine officers, the engineer officers, the artificers, and the stokers. They might put the marine and engineer officers together, and reduce the number to four. He wanted to show that the scheme affected all those grades, excepting the executive officers, in a prejudicial way. The scheme had jockeyed the engineer officer out of the service for all practical purposes; it had reduced the artificer to a mere engineering cobbler, and while leaving the great mass of the stoker class underpaid and scurvily treated, as they always had been, had attempted to bribe a small percentage of stokers to leave their fellows on the chance—the off-chance it was—of getting promotion. It set up immense and costly machinery, colleges, and ships, to train a class of men for the Navy who at present were obtainable from outside, and trained far better than the Navy, in his judgment, could train them. The scheme was first promulgated in December, 1902, at a time when Parliament was not sitting and when no effective criticism could be offered, but criticism was offered very soon afterwards. In March, 1903, on the statement of the Secretary to the Admiralty, a debate took place which was initiated by Mr. Gibson Bowles on a Motion for reconsideration, which was seconded by Sir John Gorst; and on that occasion two distinguished men took part in the debate. One was the late Secretary to the Admiralty, Mr. Edmund Robertson, now translated to another place, who said that the effect of the scheme would be—

> "The complete exclusion of all the unprivileged classes from the Navy, which all paid for and which belonged not to the Admiralty or to naval officers, but to the people of the country at large."

The late Prime Minister, the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, was no less emphatic in his hostility to the scheme, and said, as regarded positions which had up till then been open to brains and ability—

> "That those positions would be closed in respect of 80 or 90 per cent. of the population of the country."

That was just the conclusion he himself had reached as the result of inquiries, and he wanted to submit to the House that the Government in 1903 were not committed to the scheme. The Douglas Committee three years ago reported that the Government were not committed to the scheme, which was only then in an experimental stage. The Secretary to the Admiralty two years ago adopted that report, and therefore up to then, and as far as he knew, right up to now, the Government were not committed to the scheme except in an experimental manner. He brought the matter forward not in any narrow spirit of trade interest, although he ought to say that those with whom he was associated in trade matters were affected in an adverse way by the scheme. He might also say that he had been led to inquire into the scheme because of that fact, but he had brought it forward not because his particular trade was affected, but as a matter of broad public policy. He hoped he had said enough to show that the scheme was not a thing of antiquity; it had not any deep roots in the social life or habits of thought of the people, but it was contrary to the habits or thought of the people, and up to now it had not been accepted by the Government as a settled policy. He had said that the scheme was costly, and he would like to state, in the first place, that the statement under the Vote was a gross under-estimate of the real facts. He did not mean to say that it was wilfully misleading, but it was misleading nevertheless. It did not include all the items that were, as a matter of fact, items of expenditure in connection with the scheme. Nothing appeared in this Estimate or any other Estimate as to the cost of Osborne. He believed Osborne was taken over by the nation as a gift and in contravention of the will of the late Queen. And it had been taken over holus bolus for the purposes of this scheme without a halfpenny being charged for it. Then let them take Dartmouth College; there they had a splendidly equipped college, but he had never seen a halfpenny charged for it. It might be charged to the Public Accounts Fund, but it certainly did not appear in this Vote, or, so far as he knew, in any other Navy Estimates. Then there were three or four ships like the "Indus" at Portsmouth, the "Fisgeard," and the "Tinados," and there might be altogether ten ships at the very least for the purposes of this scheme. They had the cost of the equipment of all these ships, with scientific tools and apparatus, but so far as he knew, not a halfpenny had appeared in the Estimates. But worse still, there were many men engaged now in training—or torturing—stokers and endeavouring to make fitters and machine-men out of them, and a great many men for the purposes of this scheme were removed from their own duties in the Navy. The cost of them was spread all over the Estimates, from one end to the other—everywhere but in the place where they ought to be. The men used for the purposes of this scheme on the "Indus" alone amounted to an annual cost of £3,210, and not a halfpenny of it appeared in the £167,000 they were now discussing. So far as the cost to the nation was concerned, it was almost impossible to say what that cost was, but he did not put that forward as the main consideration at all. He now came to the cost to the parents and guardians of the students, which brought him to the kernel of the system, and he found in the Estimates for last year an item called "Appropriations in Aid," amounting to £56,000. That was in respect to rather less than 800 students, he believed. It came out to about £75 per boy of twelve years of age, in order to equip him as an officer of the Navy. What was the effect of it upon the various classes in the community who desired to send their sons into the Navy? What was the effect of it upon Members of this House? He did not suppose that any of his colleagues of the Labour Party could afford to send their sons into the Navy. He did not know one who could pay £75 a year, plus cost of outfit, pocket-money, and incidental outlays. Every one of the Labour Members was therefore barred from sending his boys into the Navy in the hope of their becoming officers. He supposed the same might be said of the Irish Members, and probably of the bulk of hon. Members opposite. He maintained that beyond a sprinkling here and there, with perhaps those on the front benches, Members of the House were excluded from sending their boys into the Navy, except as fetchers and carriers to the powers that be. If it was the case with Members of the House, it was much more so with those outside. It was quite obvious that the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was quite within the mark when he said that this scheme excluded between 80 and 90 per cent. of the population of this country from sending their boys into the Navy. What was the effect of that? It narrowed the field of selection from which we could draw these men; and therefore, in so far as operative, it was to some extent the cause, or a contributing cause of the present trouble in the Navy. He knew that brains were not always found with money; nor did he say that brains and money did not sometimes go together. He did not for a moment say that a man might have money and no brains, or that a man might have brains and no money. There was not a great deal of difference in a lot of people gathered together. But there was a great deal of difference between them so far as bringing together all classes and giving everyone something of a fair show of equality of opportunity in reaching these places in the Navy. He suggested that the new system in the Navy went in the direction of taking from those who had little and giving to those who had a surfeit. What was the system that was displaced? He was speaking now of the officer class, and not of engineers and marines. The system, so far back as he could go, was that executive-officer rank was only gained in the Navy at an early age by nomination—by what might be called artificial selection. The boy only entered the Navy by way of place, power, and influence of some kind. He did not allege anything against the rich people or against the poor. The poor would do exactly the same. He meant to say that there had been a certain class in the community in a position of place and monopoly, and that position of place and monopoly had always been used in the interest of their class. It had always been so. Therefore, he pointed out that the system had been that executive-officer rank had only been thus gained in the Navy. On the other hand there had been a system by which officers of the lower deck and engineering officers entered when their education had been more or less completed, when they reached sixteen or seventeen years of age, and therefore when some sort of sensible test could be applied to them. A test could not be applied to a boy twelve years old, he could only be taken by some sort of favour. But a character test could be applied to a lad of sixteen, and that had been applied in the case of engineering officers in the Navy. Moreover, there had been an infusion of young men from the dockyard workshops and schools who had gone to Keyham and into the naval service as the result of scholarships. These young men had to pass through the dockyard workshop, and many of those who came out with distinction were the sons of men with moderate means, and some of the highest places in the Navy had been reached by sharp lads, sons of working-class parents who had passed out of the dockyard workshops. Some of the makers of our modern Navy had come from that class. The late Chief Constructor in the dockyards, Sir William White, the late Chief Engineer, and the present Director-General were dockyard boys. Now, what had taken place? While retaining the dockyard workshops and schools in the dockyards—for which there were, he believed, some four or five thousand pounds on the Estimates this year—from which good men were obtained, they were closing the avenue by which these could enter the Navy as engineer officers. Why had that been done? No suggestion had been made that the engineer officers had not been efficient so far. Nothing of the sort had been stated, but they had grown up under a system under which all the power had been reserved to the executive officers. He knew that they could not have two executive officers—one on the bridge and the other in the engine-room. But the engineers had grown up under a system not only under which executive power had been reserved to the bridge man, but under which the engineer officer had been made to feel a sense of inferiority, and had been treated—or thought he was treated—as of social as well as financial inferiority. Instead of bridging that over by making the executive rank open to the engineer officer or those of his class, the same barrier which had hitherto been placed against him gaining executive rank had now been raised against him, under the new system, of gaining engineering rank. Competition had been abolished, the entry of engineer boys of comparatively mature age had been abolished, and in place of that they had immaturity, patronage, and class interest, and all that these involved. What was the reason for that? He found that in the Memorandum of 1902 it was stated that the Admiralty wanted—

> "To bring back that homogeneity in the Navy which existed in the time of sails,"

and that that was to be done by—

> "First, a common training, and common entry, and common instruction to all who were to command the ship; and, second, by inuring the naval officer to the sea from the earliest possible moment."

They might as well talk about bringing sails back to the Navy altogether as bringing back the conditions that prevailed under sails. Sails had entirely disappeared from the Navy, and almost completely from the mercantile marine. What had the engineer to do with the command of the ship? He did not want to command the ship, and he could not do it if he wanted. They were told that the new system involved interchangeability and standardisation. It seemed to him that those long words were mere cloaks for reactionary humbug, merely attempts to cover up educational nakedness by long-winded phrases. What had an engineer to do with sea character? As a matter of fact many of the engineers on all the great liners were men who came out of the locomotive departments of engineering works, and who in many cases never caught a glimpse of the sea till they had reached man's estate. The object of the new system was not to give the men a sea character but an Admiralty character, so that they could be relied upon to say "ditto" to anything that Admirals or hon. Gentlemen on the front benches might say. Let the House take this idea of interchangeability. A lad of twelve years of age was drafted from school into the Navy on the understanding that he might become an Admiral or an engineer, or both or neither. They stuffed his head with gunnery, navigation, international law, engineering in all its branches, hydraulics, electricity, and mechanical science generally, up to the age of twenty. At the age of twenty he began to specialise. One went to engineering, more or less by compulsion; he would not go by choice; and another went to the bridge. It seemed to him that it was impossible to get a trained engineer in that way. It was a crazy idea. They could standardise or interchange the different parts of a motor car; they could standardise a crank-pin; but they could not interchange a crank-pin with a piston rod. It was just as absurd to try to interchange a captain with an engineer as it would be to interchange a captain with a chaplain, or a powder-monkey with a printer. Let the House consider the changes constantly taking place in engineering and in naval science. Some of those lads specialised at the age of twenty—one went as captain and the other as engineer, the idea being that in the event of need afterwards, a man might suddenly be converted from an engineer into a captain or from a commander into an engineer. If the captain got killed the engineer was to be called out of the stokehole to go on the bridge or *vice versa*. The whole thing was preposterous. Engineering was constantly getting more intricate and complicated, so that an engineer on shore only followed part of it. How could a man who had been at sea for ten years, even supposing he had specialised, be expected to make himself acquainted with all the developments of engineering science as well as naval science? A race of giants would be needed to carry out a scheme of that kind; and the methods by which these boys of twelve were selected and trained were not methods which would produce giants. Far from these boys being above the average ability they would be below it. They were taken away from other boys destined for other callings, separated from the life of the nation, and made a class apart, with all the slackness that such separation involved. They would have no idea as to what calling they would follow in life. They would be thrust into a calling, not from the free choice which a boy might make. He had up till now spoken of the scheme as it affected the top of the profession; he wanted now to come a little lower down in the scale to the engine-room artificers. The man at the top would be a jack of all trades and a master of none. Therefore one would have thought that provision would have been made for better men a little lower down so that it would be an engineer who would attend to the practical work that had to be done while the superior person was strutting about in gold lace and sword. They had not got a better man. The Navy had the best engineer operatives to draw from in the whole world. He had been to America and to various continental nations and on board their ships, and he found engineers out of the British workshops in positions of great responsibility and power not only as artificers but as engineer officers in the American Navy. These men were obtained by our Navy at no cost at all. These men had put in their time in the workshops and the technical colleges. Many of them were men of natural aptitude, and the men who came out of our workshops and technical colleges were the best operatives in the world. These men were got for nothing. They were invited to join, they came freely for the Service. Workpeople had struggled to give their lads this trade at a cost for each which he estimated at from £150 to £200, and they had been placed at the disposal of the country. They joined the Navy at twenty-two years of age and there were now in the Navy some 4,000 of them. He did not know what fault could be found with them. They had been the subject of commendation in high quarters for their ability and loyalty and discipline. The only reason he had heard for making a change was one which was incautiously disclosed by a Member above the gangway last year. "The object of the scheme," he said, "was to get free from the outside pressure of trade unions." Here was the same spirit as was manifested all through; instead of a disposition to rectify grievances, they found simply a bull-headed assertion of class rights and a determination to regard these men as mere dumb inarticulate fetchers and carriers to the powers that be or that this scheme would make them so. The artificers were to be superseded by two classes. The first of these was the boy artificers' class. The Admiralty was to train boys to take the places of the artificers, or some of them. Possibly a boy might be so trained if he were taken young enough, though the chances were against his being made as efficient as some one trained outside, because his experience would not be so wide. These young men who joined at twenty-two years of age had got their varied experiences, and there was a spirit of comradeship among them that dispersed that experience. The Admiralty, however, had a perfect right to train a boy, but the money spent for this purpose was sheer waste, as the proper material could be had without any such expenditure. As to the new class to be trained as mechanicians, he observed that it was, generally speaking, impossible to make men without previous experience of engineering mechanicians at twenty-six or twenty-eight years of age. In the "Indus" last year 127 men were under training. As far as he could gather, it cost, in one way and another, nearly

£30,000 to train them. For 1,000 mechanicians and 1,000 boy artificers the cost of training would amount to nearly £1,000,000. This money was not only wasted, but involved the Navy in risks which ought not to be run. For efficiency as an engineer and mechanic, not only manual skill, but the intuitive faculties, which only came to development in the formative period of the mind, were required. A man in the mercantile marine before he could go to sea, and do full duty, must serve four years as a mechanic, and, before getting leave to compete in his first examination for competence to take charge of engines, must serve at least a year at sea; and if it was necessary for the mercantile marine, how much the more necessary should it be for the Navy. He was strengthened in his opinion by something that had recently arisen. In the "Irresistible" recently one of these men opened a certain valve-box which admitted water, in ignorance that another valve was open under the waterline, and the result was that the ship narrowly escaped foundering. It had been said that the mechanician class would give opportunities of advancement to the stoker. The statement he believed to be an afterthought. The scheme could not affect more than 10 per cent. of the stokers. At the outside only 2,000 or 3,000 men in the stoker rating could be advanced, and this over a number of years. Not more than one-tenth of those could be advanced in any one year, and this was an infinitesimal fraction of 30,000, which was their total number. He was not against stokers' advancement. On the contrary, he was in favour of it, and, in conjunction with others, he had pointed out to the Admiralty positions to which they could be promoted and which did not involve technical knowledge or manual skill. But the stokers wanted more pay, and they were entitled to it, instead of which they were being foisted off with the mere dregs of this wretched class scheme. He was very glad to have had an opportunity of putting this matter before the House, and in conclusion he would express the view that the scheme was one which put place and power into the hands of people with money, and prevented people without money from obtaining those positions to which they had a perfect right if they were properly qualified to fill them. He believed this had been the cause of a good deal of friction already—friction which was a source of weakness and discredit to the Navy at the present moment. He hoped that hon. Gentlemen opposite would assist hon. Members on the Labour Benches by seeing to it that their public posts were not preserved as they had hitherto been, for people who belonged to the classes who had money and position, and who had the ear of those in authority. He hoped that hon. Members would assist them in seeing that so far as was humanly possible these positions not only in the Navy, but in all the public services, were left open to brain and ability, wherever brain and ability were to be found. He had merely touched the fringe of the subject, had merely peeped into a vast region which would yet have to be explored by those who wanted reform of our administrative departments. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty would give attention to what might be said in this discussion. He could assure him that he himself meant business in this matter. He wanted an inquiry by some independent body of men, and not men in the Navy. He was not going to be palmed off by some report which the right hon. Gentleman had received from the Admiralty, or from any officer connected with the Navy. He wanted an independent inquiry into the actual working out of this scheme by men who had a practical knowledge of these matters. If he did not get that, he should certainly divide the House in order to see how many there were present who would place efficiency before anything else, and who would see to it, so far as it could be done, that everybody had fair play and no favour.

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £166,900, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Barnes.*)

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis) said he rose to support the hon. Member for the Blackfriars Division, who had attacked this scheme in a speech of conspicuous ability. The hon. Member and himself were in the same difficulty in appealing to the First Lord of the Admiralty and in attacking this principle of interchangeability; for the House well knew the First Lord of the Admiralty himself was a conspicuous example of interchangeability, having accepted three most important posts in the Government in succession. But their very point was this, that they were not all geniuses; that they had to deal with the average officer. They all knew that the right hon. Gentleman had extensive political merits, and that he was equal to almost any task he undertook. In the scheme which the hon. Member had attacked, they had first of all to consider the motives with which it was introduced. They knew that, at the time it was brought forward, by a process of discreditable rigging, nearly every pressman who would write up the scheme was in full possession of all its details.

*The CHAIRMAN: I think the inception of the scheme is rather ancient history. What we are dealing with is the scheme itself.

Mr. BELLAIRS: I understood we were to have a general discussion on the scheme.

*The CHAIRMAN: But not the past history. The discussion is upon the scheme of education, as applicable to the Estimates of 1908–9.

Mr. BELLAIRS said he would confine himself to this year's Estimate, and pass on to the fact that into this scheme there had been no inquiry of any kind. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, when he was Secretary to the Admiralty, was asked whether any of the admirals at sea had been consulted as to the scheme of education that was being discussed. The right hon. Gentleman's answer on that occasion was that there was no necessity to consult them, and that the Board of Admiralty, by their constitution, were perfectly competent to construct such a scheme without consulting any of the sea officers. It was perfectly true they had that right, because all those officers were gaining experience at sea, and sooner or later would have to administer the scheme on being recruited by the Board of Admiralty. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon had only a few months before stated that the Sea Lords of the Admiralty had no time to consider the matter; he had stated that in the House. If they had no time to consider it, surely it was the right thing to have an inquiry before a scheme of such importance was introduced. Lord Esher had stated that the facts had all been adumbrated by the First Sea Lord before even they arrived at the Board of Admiralty. Therefore, the scheme of the Board of Admiralty was the scheme of the First Sea Lord. This was the scheme which was flung at the head of the country, as his hon. friend had pointed out, on Christmas Day, 1902. They had to consider the state of affairs when the scheme was introduced. Was there at that time, anything wrong with the Navy? As the hon. Gentleman had pointed out, the engineers were the best possible engineers, and they had the knowledge that the Navy stood in need of reform. He himself was at that time writing articles in *The Times*, and in magazines, urging reform; and in reply to those articles, Lord Selborne gave his own impressions about the state of the Navy at that time, and said on the authority of the admirals, captains, and seamen, that they were unanimously of opinion that the training of the officers and men could hardly be improved, except in matters of detail. That was the opinion of the First Lord who had sanctioned these enormous and stupendous changes. In his Memorandum of April, 1902, Lord Selborne reaffirmed that opinion. The reforms which naval officers were advocating at that time were the improvement of gunnery and of seamanship by greater concentration upon those subjects; but he did not see how they were going to improve either gunnery or seamanship by taking away a number of officers to spend 30 per cent. of their time in the engine-room. A lad entered the training ship at thirteen years of age and the Navy at seventeen-and-three-quarter years of age. He spent a large amount of his time in learning engineering, and when he got afloat he had to spend 30 per cent. of his time down in the engine-room. He was thus taken away from gunnery, and he certainly would not be improved either in gunnery or seamanship in that way. The changes were described by Sir John Fisher himself as "stupendous." They were described by Lord Selborne as amounting to a "revolution." They had since heard them described by Lord Tweedmouth, the former First Lord of the Admiralty in the present Government, as "experimental." In those three words they got the description of these enormous changes — "stupendous," "revolutionary," "experimental." Yet, though the changes were thus described, they had been unable hitherto to get any inquiry. His hon. friend had said he intended to go to a division unless hope was held out that an inquiry of some description would be instituted. They did not wish to tie down the right hon. Gentleman in the least as to what was to be the form of the inquiry. He would be perfectly satisfied if the Government would state that the inquiry was to be an impartial one. He would be quite willing that it should be secret if they would guarantee that it was impartial; but he claimed that in order to avoid all these conceptions which were afloat amongst officers, all those criticisms which they were constantly having, and which spoiled discipline in the Navy, they ought to have an inquiry of some sort. In the service there were three great branches—the engineers, who dealt with the engines; the executive branch, who dealt with the ship; and the marines. Each branch was absolutely distinct and separate. The engineer was down below, and it took four or five minutes to descend to the place where he worked. His whole training was one of the ear, and the acuteness of his hearing was brought to such a pitch that he could at once tell whether anything was wrong with the machinery. The men on deck had external work—sometimes taking observations of the heavenly bodies among their other duties. He had always to use his eyes, while the engineer worked by the ear. In the marines, they had a body of men who had been described by Lord St. Vincent as the "sheet anchor" of England, and whose discipline was even finer than that of the blue-jackets. The upshot of the policy of the Admiralty, with these disputes in regard to the officers, must ultimately and inevitably result in the disbandment of the corps. That was certainly borne out by the evidence of many witnesses. There was not an Army officer in the House who would not bear him out in saying that, when they came to try the scheme and made the executive officers wear the uniform of the Navy, and go as temporary specialists in charge of the Marines, they would not be real officers of the corps, and the inevitable result would be that a fine body of about 17,000 men would be reduced by about 3,000, and ultimately disbanded altogether. The argument had been used that the same class of men formerly worked the motive power as worked the guns, but when they had men below deck the two classes were separate and distinct. The seamen were on deck and could control the guns as well as the masts and sails, which they had to work according as the wind varied, and in order to bring the guns to bear. Therefore, there was then every reason for an interchange between the guns' crews and the men working the motive power, but now there was no necessity for the slightest interchange. The men down in the engine room were not exposed to shot and shell at all. The whole history of modern warfare proved that they were completely protected by the protective deck. The only casuality that could come to them was if the ship sank, and then the question did not arise whether they wanted to reinforce the motive power. He passed to some of the arguments which were used last year, and the year before, by advocates of the scheme on the front benches, both of which he regretted to say were more or less responsible. The argument was used that the executive class of deck officer absorbed the navigation branch. They did. There was every reason for absorbing the navigation branch. They had to navigate and handle the ship in precisely the same way as the executive branch did their work on the bridge and on deck. They were subject to be shot in action, and they wanted other men to relieve them. The work was seamanship, and was exactly similar work to that which the executive officers were always performing, and they had sooner or later to absorb them. There was no parallel whatever between the executive deck officers absorbing the navigation branch and the deck officers absorbing the engineer branch and becoming engineers. Then it was also said that they had gunnery and torpedo specialists, and there was no reason why they should not have executive officers, not only for gunnery and torpedo work, but for engineering work, in the same way. But did his hon. friends who used that argument realise what gunnery and torpedo work was? To be a torpedo specialist was as a drop in the ocean, compared with being a first class engineer. The first class engineer had the training of a lifetime. All executive officers had to know gunnery and torpedo. The only difference was that gunnery and torpedo specialists went through a more advanced course. Not only that, but the gunnery and torpedo specialist remained a seaman, and did watch-keeping duties, so that the case of the engineer was totally different. They would not be able to bring the engineer on deck to take watch-keeping duties because he would be attending to his engine room duties. Then, finally, it was said to be extremely hard lines that under the old scheme an engineer commander could not command a ship. His hon. friend had dealt with that point pretty fully. The engineer was an engineer. The command of a ship was a totally distinct thing. He did not feel any grievance that he could not be King of England, and he did not think naval officers had felt it a grievance that their warlike training and their knowledge of armaments prevented them from becoming Archbishop of Canterbury. The profession of engineering and the profession of commanding a ship were as distinct as the profession of armaments and the duties of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The hon. Member for Fareham said last year that if an officer did not show an aptitude for commanding a ship at any time it was obvious that he would not get a command. But how were they going to find out? In answer to a Question the Admiralty stated that the temporary engineer specialist for the executive branch remained an engineer for about fourteen years and would then revert as commander, to command a ship if necessary. How were they going to find out whether such a man after fourteen years work in the engine room was fit to command a ship? Presumably the hon. Member for Fareham would put him in charge of a "Dreadnought" and find out by experience, and if his boat was lost would put up to his memory a tablet with the inscription: "He was found unfit to command a ship at a cost of £4,000,000 to the taxpayer." The Secretary to the Admiralty in 1906 said the sole reason for the introduction of the scheme was that there was a want of unity between the three branches of the service. He absolutely denied that statement. He had never heard of want of unity between the marines and the executive branch, and as regarded the engineers it was enormously exaggerated. It had never interfered with the relations in the ward room mess or the gun room mess. They had grievances, but that was not a reason for doing away with them altogether, but for patiently inquiring into the grievances and remedying them. It was not a reason for revolutionising a great service by what had officially been described as a stupendous revolutionary experiment. As a matter of fact he knew it was the intention in connection with this scheme to dish the engineering agitation which was subscribed to by about sixty Members of Parliament. Many of the points which they contended for were legitimate grievances. There were the questions of pay and promotion, and these could have been met without any revolutionary experiment. He had heard that by this scheme they made 500 marine officers available for watch-keeping duties. But they did not do it by this scheme, though it was perfectly simple to do, and it was being done now. The Admiralty were wisely making much more use of marine officers and giving them executive duties to do in their spare time. In regard to artificers, they were making three classes. They would have the boy artificers, the skilled recruits, and the stoker mechanicians. These three classes were to do one job. Yet they had introduced a scheme for the sake of unity of the service by which they suppressed three totally distinct branches and had one class to do three distinct jobs, viz., handling the ships, handling the engines, and handling the troops. For these they created one class, and under the very same scheme they did away with the system of doing the engine-room watch-keeping duties by the artificer and introduced two other classes—stoker mechanics and boy artificers. Were they going to increase the unity of the service by that method? They dissatisfied the artificers who were satisfied before the scheme was introduced, and they introduced an inefficient class of stoker mechanicians who would before the scheme was very much older be responsible, he was confident, for many other disasters besides that of the "Irresistible." His hon. friend had referred to the system of entry, and, as he had pointed out, there was a system of nomination for the executive branch, but for the other classes, marines and engineers, they had open competition. All that open competition was swept away. The Navy was divorced from the schools of the country. Only those who educated boys under thirteen would now supply officers. They cut them off from the technological schools, the public schools, and the grammar schools of the country by this scheme. Then they gave an education in the colleges, which his hon. friend very much understated, because he merely gave them the fees for education. The amount which the parent had to pay was from £550 to £600 for four years, and he had to provide the uniform at the end of the four years. When the scheme was introduced *The Times* described it as a democratic scheme under which either the cook's son or the duke's son could present himself at the common avenue of entry. There were some millionaires in that House, but he did not believe they paid their cooks enough to enable them to put their sons into the Navy at that cost. They did not make the scheme democratic by giving a common avenue of entry. They had a common avenue of entry into Heaven, but St. Peter was at the gate exercising the power of selection. They had been told it was more difficult for a rich man to enter Heaven than to pass through the eye of a needle. It was harder now for a poor man to get his son into the Navy for any one of the three branches than for a "Dreadnought" to pass through the eye of a needle. St. Vincent, one of the greatest Admirals we had ever had, who was so poor that he had to mend his own boots, and the parson's son, Nelson, had to present themselves at the common avenue of entry, but they could not possibly get up this avenue. That was what was given to the country as a democratic scheme, but there was nothing democratic about it from beginning to end. Lord Tweedmouth, when First Lord of the Admiralty, said that what the Navy needed was a period of rest. That was so; but periods of rest were also periods of inquiry. They were not asking the right hon. Gentleman to change the scheme, but they were asking for an impartial inquiry into the scheme itself. It was not a scheme which affected the present, and they were asking the right hon. Gentleman to inquire into the scope and effect of the scheme so that they might know the position some years hence. No nation had copied us in this matter, and the only other Navy which had such a scheme was the American, in which it had been a failure. The Minister responsible said the artificers would be the future engineers. The very Admiral who was responsible, Admiral Evans, had issued a Report commenting in the strongest terms on the inefficiency of this department of the Navy. ["No."] If any hon. Member questioned that he could give the actual quotation from Admiral Evans' Report. At the bottom of the scheme was the idea of early entry and early training in responsibility. To show how absolutely they had gone away from the ideas of Sir John Fisher and his colleagues he would read to the House what they said as to the merits of early training in responsibility. He had in his hand a document labelled "Private and Confidential," issued by the Admiralty, containing portions of articles on entry and training of officers, men and boys in the Navy, but there was nothing confidential in it. It stated—

> It is a known and conclusive fact that never in the history of the Navy were better officers produced than when the midshipman on entry into the service went straight to sea at twelve or thirteen years of age. They became men instead of remaining boys, as is the case at present when herded together as a mass of boys in a training-ship or college. When thus distributed throughout the Fleet on entry they received far more individual attention and training from their captains and officers, and from the moment they stepped on board they became officers habituated to command, and ceased to be schoolboys ordered about by inferiors.

> "Shore-going people cannot realise the immense advantage (permeating the whole after-life) of the system of a lad of twelve or thirteen years of age being thrust at once into a position of command, and having to accept responsibility, and thus acquiring, almost with his mother's milk, the alertness and resource which gave us Nelson."

The same document went on to say:—

> "The most frightful error ever committed was raising the age of entry of midshipmen, when, with all the teachings of history before us, and the magnificent traditions of hundreds of years of our great service, we aped continental systems of naval education and pandered to the headmasters of public schools by departing from the magnificent practical custom of our forefathers, which gave us our Nelsons and made boys of twelve and thirteen take the responsibilities of command, with the result of imbibing those habits of nerve, decision, and command which gave us our great sea victories."

And what had they done? The Admiralty had adoped a scheme which sent a boy to sea after he was seventeen and a half years of age and gave him responsibility for the first time at that age. As a matter of fact they had travelled right away from where the Admiralty first intended to travel. They now entered the boys young, and in order to give them some sort of apology for mechanical knowledge as engineers they kept them in the training college up to the age of seventeen, and then they were given six months in a training ship, where no responsibility was incurred. In conclusion he appealed to hon. Members to support them in their very moderate demand for an inquiry into this scheme. It might take a thousand years to form a State, and only one hour might lay it in the dust, and what was true of a State was equally true of the Navy.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said the hon. Member for King's Lynn had stated the case against the present scheme with very considerable ability. But before he went into the details of the scheme he desired to deal with the charge of the hon. Member for the Blackfriars division that only persons with money and able to reach the ear of those in authority could get their sons into the Navy. What was exactly the system under the new scheme? The son of any person, no matter what his rank or position in the world, had a right to be examined by the Interview Committee. There was no distinction of class among the candidates. He attended at an interview and heard the kind of questions put to the candidates, and he could say that these questions were entirely directed to discovering the boy's suitability for the Navy, his general intelligence, and how far he had assimilated his education at school. After the interview the committee divided the candidates into various classes, and laid their report before the First Lord of the Admiralty. He did not say it was binding upon the First Lord in every case to select only the boys who were in the top class, for there might be an exceptional boy, here and there, who ought to be taken out of the lower classes into which he was put as the result of the interview. But he did say that almost without exception the boys were taken in accordance with their position in the classes. There was no such thing as having the ear of persons in authority as a means of entering the Navy at the present moment. As a matter of fact entrance into the Navy was far easier and more democratic—if he might use the word—than ever it had been before. He admitted that the parents of boys intended for the Navy must have some means. Perhaps he might say that the means should be fairly ample. It was the fact that the training at Osborne and Dartmouth cost £75 a year for four years, though the fees might be reduced to £40 a year for the sons of officers of the Army and Navy. But was the training of the naval officer ever free? Was its cost ever so low as it was at the present moment?

MR. BELLAIRS said the training was much longer now. Formerly it ranged from fifteen months to two years. Now it lasted for four years.

MR. MCKENNA said his hon. friend must know that that did not cover the whole case, and the cost of the training of the boy under the old system was not the only expense to the parents. There was the preliminary two years private tuition, the cost of which far exceeded £75 a year.

*MR. BARNES said he had not referred to the training of the executive officer. His point was that the present system was more costly than the old in regard to the engineer officer.

MR. MCKENNA said he felt bound to make it clear that poor parents could send their sons into the Navy more easily than ever before. With regard to the training for engineer officers, if the difference between the time at which the training began at Osborne and at Keyham were considered, it would be found that the financial burden was not such as to justify the charge that the door was now closed to whole classes of parents who wished to send their sons into the Navy. His hon. friend the Member for the Blackfriars division found himself in considerable difficulty in dealing with the question of engineer officers. The hon. Member had admitted that there was a grievance among engineer officers and said that the remedy which the Admiralty had adopted was to exclude all persons except those who would in the ordinary course become executive officers. His remedy was to open the rank of executive officer to the engineer.

MR. BARNES indicated dissent.

MR. MCKENNA said he understood the hon. Member to suggest that the engineers were to be trained and then admitted as executive officers.

MR. BARNES: Not at all, I did not say so.

MR. MCKENNA: I took down the words.

MR. BARNES: Possibly I may have used wrong words and I wish to correct myself now. I meant simply this, that the executive rank should be open to the same class from which hitherto the engineer class have come.

MR. MCKENNA said he understood the hon. Member to say that once a man had become an engineer the fact was to be taken as a mark that he was fit to take executive rank.

MR. BARNES: He has never asked to do that so far as I am aware.

MR. MCKENNA said he had had to make himself acquainted with the facts and he could state that the engineer did so at the present moment. He would be surprised if he did not hear something of that in the course of the present debate. The hon. Member went on to ask what the engineer had to do with the manning of a ship. If an engineer had been exclusively trained from boyhood as an engineer, it was difficult, though not so impossible as the hon. Member thought, to say that he should have to do with the manning of the ship. The hon. Member had made considerable fun of what he regarded as the preposterous idea that there could be interchangeability between executive officers and engineers. The word was not used at the Admiralty. Common entry and common training with subsequent specialisation were by no means interchangeability. But it did so happen that the American system to which reference had been made in the course of the debate was a system to which the word "interchangeability" might be better applied than to our system. The latest expert evidence as to the success of the American system showed that men who had been at one time engineers had been made captains, and executive officers had been made engineers. The evidence at the Admiralty led to an entirely different conclusion from that of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, that the American system had been a disastrous failure. Captain Hood, our Naval Attaché at Washington, whose business it was to inquire into the working of this very system, had inquired, and this was what he said—

> "In the first instance, it must be definitely and distinctly stated that the amalgamation of line and engineer branches is now regarded as a great success by all classes in the United States Navy; minor criticisms are still directed to the method in which it was carried out, but no competent person can be found, who either considers the amalgamation a failure, or wishes it had not taken place. . . . Opinions have been asked of all classes of naval officers, of Heads of Bureaux and Admirals, of old engineer officers now amalgamated, of old line officers, and of the young and rising generation. All are united in the opinion that the scheme has been a success, that in general principle it was correct, and that any alteration of the general

principle of amalgamation would be a regrettable and dangerous set-back. . . . The rules as originally laid down have been kept to and preserved with a strong hand; at first there was much criticism and much opposition, but this has all passed away. . . . It must, again, be positively stated that there is no difference of opinion about the fact that the new education has produced engineer officers able to take care of, manipulate and repair with perfect efficiency the engines of modern men-of-war; out of nineteen battleships in commission at the end of 1907, on board of eleven the senior engineer officer had not belonged to the old class of engineers; and it is now the opinion of the service, young and old, that these officers, for duty on board ship in charge of machinery are superior to the class of men that they are rapidly supplanting."

That was the only positive evidence which the Committee could have in regard to what had happened in America in the actual working of the scheme, and what had happened there was a complete justification of the change which was introduced in 1903, as to the system of common entry in the Navy. The Committee would probably be interested to know that our own system had reached the stage at which the first batch of cadets had become midshipmen. These cadets went for their first cruise on the "Cumberland"; their final examination took place in April last, and the report of the examiners was generally extremely favourable. With regard to seamanship, for instance, the examiners said—

> "The opinion of the Board in general was that they were exceptionally well up in all the subjects in which they examined them. Two of the officers had had experience of cadets' examination, and they both expressed the opinion that the general knowledge shown this year is a decided improvement on last year. Personally, I was surprised at the practical knowledge they had gathered in so short a time as six months."

The examiners in practical navigation reported—

> "Practical Navigation.—The paper was of the same standard as that set for acting sub-lieutenants, but somewhat shorter. There are three principal features that call for special comment in the worked papers sent in: (1) The consistency of the work done, there being not more than one paper which can be called poor; (2) the extraordinary accuracy with which each part of the paper was worked. There was hardly an instance of a course being wrongly corrected, or of a bearing being incorrectly plotted on the chart, or of corrections to declinations, etc., being applied the wrong way; (3) the commendable neatness and methodical arrangement of the work in almost every paper sent in. As far as is possible to judge, the methods employed appeared to be intelligently understood, and gave evidence of having been learnt from practical observations. I can only add that I consider the standard reached is higher than that of the average class of acting sub-lieutenants, in the same work, when passing for the rank of lieutenant."

He thought he had given sufficient ground for support of the Government in refusing to admit an inquiry into the system. An inquiry could only mean a vote of want of confidence in the Board of Admiralty. [An HON. MEMBER: Why?] He would tell them why. The Board of Admiralty consisted, in addition to the First Lord, of four Sea Lords, who were selected from admirals with great sea experience—the best men whom the Government of the day could choose for the work of giving scientific, expert advice on all questions connected with the Navy. The Sea Lords advised a certain course on a subject directly within their province. They were responsible for the education of the officers. Having given their advice, and Parliament having acted on their advice, it surely implied a vote of censure if their expert opinion was disregarded and an inquiry now asked for to go into the working of the system. The Board of Admiralty were making from day to day, close investigation into the whole of the system. The Board alone were the proper authority to inquire, so long as the House had confidence in the Board, and if there was not that confidence the right method to follow was not to inquire into the working of any particular point, but to overthrow the Board. So long as the present Board remained the Admiralty, they were not willing to accept inquiry into their work.

MR. BELLAIRS: Are we never to have an inquiry?

MR. McKENNA said the Board of Admiralty were constantly instituting inquiries into the working of the system. Although the present proposal took a specious form, he hoped the Committee would understand that it meant an expression of want of confidence in the Board of Admiralty. [Cries of "No, no."] The present Board could not accept the proposal as being anything but an expression of want of confidence in them. As the late Prime Minister had been quoted as an authority in support of the Motion of the hon. Member, he would remind the Committee that the late Prime Minister, after experience, accepted the system, and when asked the specific question declined to grant an inquiry; therefore, his name could not be used as that of an authority in support of the Motion for inquiry. He passed from that specific point to the question of the engine-room artificers. It had been assumed that the reason for the introduction of mechanician rating was to get rid of the influence of trade unions, but he assured his hon. friend that there was no idea of the kind at the Admiralty.

MR. BARNES said he had made no such imputation; he quoted an opinion expressed last year in the House by a Member who was now serving in His Majesty's Navy.

MR. McKENNA said he knew that his hon. friend quoted the dictum of a former Member, but he understood him in quoting to indicate that that was probably the case. If so, he could assure his hon. friend that there was no ground for such a suspicion. The introduction of boy artificers was to meet a difficulty found in enlisting fully-trained engine-room artificers, to secure a certainty of supply. A constant supply was an imperative necessity, there must be no risk of running short in time of need. This was the sole reason for training boy artificers as they did. Engine-room artificers were still enlisted from outside, because only two-thirds of the supply could be obtained by training the boys. Both his hon. friends had been led into serious misapprehension as to the new rating of mechanicians. The mechanician was not a mechanic, nor was he trained as a mechanic; it was not necessary he should be.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): All name and no qualification.

MR. McKENNA said that no doubt his hon. friend was familiar with the subject. The engine-room artificer was enlisted primarily for repairs of the engines on the ship, and he had the artisan's qualification for the work, and when he got on board he began to learn a new trade, engine-driving and watching. What was now proposed was to confine the engine-room artificer to those duties for which he was engaged, to keep him to the duty of repairs for which he was trained and qualified. It was in pursuance of a policy of efficiency and economy the Admiralty conceived that they should get a greater portion of the repairs done at sea, but if the engine-room artificer was taken off to work at engine-driving and watch-keeping he was taken away from his proper work. So the new rating of mechanicians was started; it did not supplant the engine-room artificer, and when his hon. friend talked about three classes of artificers to do the same job he was using language without meaning. Boy artificers were trained on board ship to become engine-room artificers, and were taken from the same social class as engine-room artificers. The mechanician did not do the same work, he started his career as a stoker. There were 30,000 stokers in the service, and until the new system was introduced the stoker had no prospect of improvement. During previous debates on the subject there was shown a unanimity of opinion that something should be done for the stokers. [AN HON. MEMBER on the LABOUR Benches: Increase their wages.] Whatever had been proposed, a reason had been found against it. What the Admiralty had done was this. They had taken the most promising stokers between the ages of twenty-eight and thirty-two—probably the ages ultimately would be between twenty-five and thirty—and had given them slight training—not that of a skilled artisan—in mechanical work to enable them to understand the general run of an engine they would be called upon to drive, also some additional education in the elements of general knowledge, in the hope that hereafter they would rise to the rank of warrant officers, a position in which it was desirable a man should have some smattering of general education. After two years' training, which would not cost the enormous sum suggested, but £27 a year, £54 in all, the mechanician or stoker selected to become mechanician, if he passed a qualifying examination, would act as a mechanician and carry on engine-driving and watch-keeping. He would not supplant the engine-room artificer in any of the duties the latter was trained to perform, he would only undertake duties the engine-room artificer himself learned only since he entered the Navy. The Admiralty were not bringing trained men at the public expense to supplant engine-room artificers specially qualified for the work for which they were enlisted; they were offering to stokers the opportunity for advancing to the rank of warrant officers. Every engine-room artificer in the Navy would continue to have exactly the same opportunity for advancement as heretofore, and 30,000 stokers would have the opportunity of rising and finding a remedy for their grievances. He had not the total number of mechanicians with him, but it would be between 5 per cent. and 10 per cent. It would not be more than 10 per cent. That had been the reason for this change, and he hoped the Committee would agree with him that much of the criticism that had been directed against it had been founded on a mistake as to what the system was found to be. Both his hon. friends had instanced the accident on board the "Irresistible" as an example of the calamities that would occur if men who had been trained as stokers, now in the new mechanician rating, were to be allowed to touch the engines. The Committee would be surprised to hear that that accident was not due to the mechanician. It was the officer in charge who was in fault. There had been an inquiry into the accident and the mechanician had been freed from all blame. It was not fair that whenever an accident occurred hon. Members should immediately turn all the evidence that arose out of the inquiry into an argument against a particular system when the system had nothing to do with the accident. He had now dealt with all the points that had been raised. His hon. friend the Financial Secretary would deal with any others that might arise later in the debate, but he thought it desirable to get up when he did in order to put right the serious misconception in the minds of the Committee as to the extent and purposes of this scheme. He hoped now the Committee would be prepared to endorse the policy of the Admiralty on the scheme.

*Mr. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness) pointed out that although it was quite true that the stokers desired advancement they did not ask for that kind of advancement which the Admiralty had given them. What the stokers asked for was more pay, and if the Admiralty would consider the matter as they should do, in the same way as an ordinary employer considered the grievances put before him by his employees, he thought the situation might be eased very considerably. It was with great delight that he had listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, who was a most able man, but what had been evidenced to him in the discussion, and always was evidenced on these occasions when naval questions were being discussed in that Assembly, was that the right hon. Gentleman and his predecessors in office knew very little about the business, and failed to notice the niceties of the question. Hon. and right hon. Members who took part in the discussion seemed to forget that there was such a thing as the mercantile marine. The right hon. Gentleman had dealt very skilfully with the question of the promotion of the stokers and had told the Committee that the engine-room artificers were not to be interfered with at all. That statement only indicated that the right hon. Gentleman did not understand the matter at all, because so soon as the stoker was promoted to mechanician rank and took over watch-keeping duty, directly he started out on his first watch he became the superior officer to the artificer engineer.

Mr. McKENNA: No, we shall keep the proportion of officers. As many men will become officers under the new system as there were before.

*Mr. C. DUNCAN said that that did not get rid of the difficulty that as soon as the mechanician took up his first watch, so soon he became the superior officer of the watch. The artificers were properly qualified men, as was admitted on all sides, but if the stoker was keeping watch, if something went wrong with the engines, it was then the business of the stoker to direct the properly qualified artificer to go and do the repairs that might be necessary. If that was the position, what was done was to take a man from a lower rank, give him special training, and put him above a man who was himself specially trained in the business, and that seemed to him to be the wrong way to go about the matter. The fact that there was a mercantile marine had been forgotten. If it was reasonable to compare the position of those who drove the engines of the ships of the mercantile marine and those who drove the engines of the ships in the Navy, one would assume that in the Navy men with higher capacity and ability would be required because of the need of them there. But in the mercantile marine the men who drove the engines from those of the smallest to those of the largest ships were men who had to qualify at the Board of Trade to obtain their certificates as first, second, or third class engineers. Those men were all drawn from those who served their time in the engineering shops. They were exactly the same kind of men who went into the Navy as artificers. But to-day the man who joined the mercantile marine from the engineering ranks had an excellent opening given to him. There were thousands driving engines to-day, the engines of the largest vessels afloat, and if those men were qualified to take high positions with large powers of control over large bodies of men, why were the same class of men going to be degraded in the Navy? He had no objection to the stokers being advanced, but he certainly objected to the men turned out of the engineering shops of the country into the Navy being degraded. However clever the argument might be, there was no getting away from the fact that the same kind of men in the mercantile marine had splendid positions open to them, whilst in the Navy they were faced with the fact that as soon as the stoker was advanced to the rank of mechanician, he was the superior officer and took charge of the artificer. The right hon. Gentleman had said that for the accident on board the "Irresistible" the mechanician was not to blame, but his information was that the cause of the accident was that a mechanician was put in charge of some machinery; that he opened some valve under the water line, the water came in and flooded the ship, which had to be towed into dock. That was a magnificent start. For the first time they had been told there was a scarcity of men to take artificers' positions. That was certainly news to them. They knew, at any rate, that the test imposed on artificers joining the Navy was a very high and severe one considering the young age these men were required to join. Nothing like reasonable inducements were offered to these men. If there were, the Government would be able to command a larger number of men for the naval service than the mercantile marine commanded. But if all the advantages were with the mercantile marine, and all the disadvantages with the Navy, the Navy would not get the men. A good deal had been said as to the cost of training a mechanician; his information was to be taught for two years and that the average cost would be £140 per annum. One of the arguments used against them was that watch-keeping and the use of tools could not be performed concurrently. There was a very obvious answer, that they could not repair an engine while it was running. That the use of tools and the working of the engine-room could not be done concurrently was obvious; but the man who had been trained in the building of engines and who had varied experience of all classes of work, was surely the likeliest man to know, when the engine was working, whether anything was wrong. Not an engineer of experience, not a single individual who had followed the engineering trade, and had experience of the making, fitting, and driving of these engines, but was familiar not only with the outside of the engine but the inside as well. He was the man of all men who could tell at a glance what part of the engine was going wrong by the slightest indication, or by the slightest unusual sound. Therefore, the artificer engineers surely had a better claim to consideration than they seemed to be receiving under this scheme. It seemed to them that these men, instead of being degraded, should be given a chance of promotion. They had been told by a speaker last year—it was blurted out perhaps in an unconscious fashion—that the idea was to punish these men because they were in contact with trade unions. But that ought to be received as one of first evidences of some small degree of common sense. These men were engaged in a trade where at any time they might sustain injuries and be incapacitated for work, and it was some evidence of their judgment and common sense that they made provision for themselves by joining a trade union. At any rate, they had heard a good deal of talk in that House about the value of thrift. He hoped that the inquiry they were asking for would be granted. They had been told by the First Lord that it would be practically a vote of censure on those who had control of the Navy. They had no desire to censure anybody, whatever the position might be. But the Lords of the Admiralty were not almighty and infallible, and they should not be above advice when they realised that the whole of the new system complained of had been brought into existence after an inquiry in which only five persons were witnesses. He had read the whole of their evidence, and he had gone into the case carefully. One of the five who gave evidence was diametrically opposed to the scheme as it stood. Therefore, it seemed to him that the whole scheme was based on the flimsiest ground imaginable. It was against all engineering practice, and it was fair and reasonable to say that before the scheme was allowed to go any further, there was substantial ground for some inquiry being made into the subject with a view to minimising any difficulties that might exist. With regard to the stokers, they were not averse to helping them; indeed, they were desirous of helping them to the best of their ability. They had endeavoured to ascertain what the stokers wanted. They had been told that the stoker desired an increase of pay and a position which would in no way interfere with the work done by the engine-room artificers. Therefore, they asked that there should be an inquiry before this scheme was pressed forward to its ultimate conclusion, and before the engine-room artificers were wiped out of the Navy, because whatever civil answers in eloquent and pleasing language were given, there was no doubt among the engine-room artificers themselves that this scheme was brought in to displace them—he meant those men who had been trained in the workshop life of the country. Those who were conversant with engineering matters knew that all the inventions and improvements which had taken place were the result of civilian effort; and it seemed to him that to block out absolutely from the Navy the men who had workshop experience, and were familiar with various kinds of mechanical appliances and different descriptions of engines, was taking a step in the wrong direction. He submitted that there was at least a case for inquiry. There was no complaint against these men as to the way in which they discharged their duties, and it was very hard that, having under the system which came into operation in 1868, gained promotion step by step to higher positions, they were now to see the whole thing go by the board. It was unfair and unjust, and so far as he was concerned, if his hon. friend went to a division he should certainly go into the lobby with him.

* Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon) said that he could not, like the hon. Member who had just sat down, speak with an intimate knowledge of the engineering trade, but he thought the hon. Gentleman had rather too readily ruled the First Lord and civilians like himself out of court by saying that they were wholly unacquainted with the technicalities of that trade.

* Mr. C. DUNCAN said he had read the whole of the speeches on this question delivered in 1903, and that was the thing which had struck him more than anything.

* Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he was not disputing the hon. Member's view that he was personally better acquainted with his own trade. But, after all, there were other large spheres of operation with which people might be familiar, even though not engaged in the special industry such as the hon. Gentleman spoke of. Among them, he thought, was this great instrument of the Navy. He had had a great deal to do with it in his day. He had been in the stoke-hold of nearly every class of ship in the Navy; he had been in the engine-room; and he had been in communication with officers and men of every rank and class in the Navy for twenty-five years; and perhaps the hon.

Gentleman would do him the same courtesy as he had extended to him and would not say, when he spoke of the Navy, that he was ruled out because he had no acquaintance with the Navy. He had made it his special study. He could not help feeling that there had been too much tendency in this very important discussion to treat the Navy as if it were an institution created and sustained merely for the purpose of giving employment to certain classes of persons. That was not so. The Navy, primarily and above all, was an instrument for conducting war effectively when this country was engaged in hostilities. He did not differ by one jot from what the hon. Member for Blackfriars had said about getting the sympathy and co-operation of every class in working that great instrument. He had done what he could to familiarise people with the idea, both in regard to the Army and the Navy, that we might draw on wider classes than we had done hitherto, in order to bring them into this fascinating circle of the services. He believed that that was for the good of the country, but it should not be carried too far. In order to give a particular application to that principle, they must not forget the purposes for which the Navy was intended, and that was a principle which the hon. Member who had just spoken had certainly forgotten. Might he point out that the Board of Admiralty of which he was a member was certainly responsible for a great deal that had been under discussion that night. He could assure the hon. Member who had criticised them, that these conclusions were not arrived at without very grave consideration. He had certainly watched with the greatest possible care, both afloat and on shore, the development of these changes, and his own opinion, if it was of any value at all, had been expressed by the First Lord of the Admiralty that night, namely, that these changes so far had been very beneficial to the Navy as a fighting machine. He believed that the First Lord of the Admiralty was absolutely correct in saying that they were now opening more widely the entrance to the Navy than they had ever done before. He did not believe that it was possible to realise the whole desire of the hon. Member for Blackfriars. There must be certain qualifications for officers either of the Army or Navy, and unless the candidates possessed those qualifications, the mere fact of their belonging to a particular class ought not to be cited in their favour. This very difficulty had occurred in the United States, a democratic country where the entrance of cadets into the Navy was made by senatorial nomination. Was it suggested as a really good democratic plan that the cadets of the Royal Navy should be nominated by Members of that House? He did not think so. He thought they would find a recurrence of evils which had long since vanished, and that they would do no good to the Navy. He did not say that it was not possible to modify the present system, but he thought it was working exceedingly well, and was generally admitted to be a great success. Let it not be supposed for one moment that the question of cost was one operating in the matter at all. He knew the estimated cost was a very great exaggeration to the extent of some 50 per cent. But if the House of Commons desired the whole question of the cost could be eliminated altogether. The payment that fell on the parent was an almost insignificant fraction of the whole cost to the State of the education, and he did not think the question of cost stood in the way at all. The education that was given was very different from that suggested by the hon. Member for King's Lynn. He said they were depriving the country of the enormous advantage of getting boys from the public schools.

MR. BELLAIRS: I merely said that under this scheme as regards the executive, engineers and marines you are divorcing the Navy altogether from the technological schools, the public schools, and the grammar schools.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he accepted the alteration, but if they were doing that they were doing a great service, because he was certain the education these boys were getting was incomparably better and cheaper than anything they could get in the institutions of which the hon. Member had spoken. Then there was another misrepresentation. It had been said that there was to be interchangeability, but he did not think so. There was to be common entry, common training, and specialisation, but that was a very different thing from interchange. He was surprised when the hon. Member for Blackfriars told them that by introducing this system and effecting common entry they were inflicting injustice upon some section of the community whose spokesman he constituted himself, and he was more surprised when the hon. Member told them that there was no demand on the part of engineer officers for executive rank. That seemed to him to be very far from what was common knowledge. He remembered very well indeed the genesis of this change and the state of things with which they were then confronted. It was the fact that engineer officers could not enter into the fruition of their position of officers in the Navy, and that the privileges, and rewards, and distinction which ought to be open to every commissioned officer, were closed to the engineer officer, and it was quite easy to see how they were closed. There were some 400 ships in commission, in every one of which there was a captain or commander, lieutenants and engineer officers, and the engineer officers used to number five or six. As long as they remained in the rank of lieutenant, or even commander, promotion was comparatively proportionate to the number of entries, but the moment they reached the neck of the bottle, as it were, and got to the important position of post-captain, promotion was to all intents and purposes closed to the whole of the engineering branch of the Navy. As a proof of it they found there was only one single engineer officer holding the rank of rear admiral in the whole Navy. That was the grievance. What happened was that all over the country great engineering institutions were becoming the centre of attraction for these engineer officers. He blamed nobody. It was the natural outcome of the situation. But the claims of the engineer officers were being taken up by associations which were not part of the Navy, because their natural ambitions were closed to them, and they could not look to the Navy for their rewards. It was to change that situation, to give that avenue of promotion, and that legitimate outlet to a man's ambitions, that common entry, which he believed at that time was universally approved by the House of Commons, was introduced into the Navy. He believed it would be a positive misfortune if for any reason they were to go back on that arrangement now. The hon. Member for Blackfriars was mistaken if he supposed that the duty of the engineer officer was limited to engine-room watch-keeping. It was part of the new scheme, and a very important part, that the number of commissioned engineers borne on the ship should be reduced and their watch-keeping duties reduced at the same time. Let the Committee remember what the engineering officer had to do. On a ship like the "Dreadnought" there were fifty or sixty high-pressure steam-engines, there were electric engines, and compressed-air engines, besides all the mechanism of the ship, which had to be under the control of highly-trained engineers. That gave an enormous scope for men of the very highest qualifications, and unless they allowed the engineer officers to pass on to positions in which they could effectively control those services they were not only doing them an injustice, but injuring the welfare of the Navy and the safety of the ships. He sympathised a good deal with what had been said by the hon. Member for Blackfriars, but he was surprised at the hon. Member for Barrow, who had said they were degrading one class of men by making them serve under men of superior rank in another trade. That was an absolutely new theory to him. The carpenter, for instance, went into a training ship at twelve or fifteen, got promoted to the carpenter's crew, and when he got warrant rank no man thought of disputing his authority over those of less rank than himself. It was the same story with the gunner, and nobody asked him whether the profession of carpenter was superior in the social scale to that of gunner; they asked what was the warrant he held under the King in the Navy. That was one of the most flagrant claims for social privilege he had ever heard put forward

*MR. C. DUNCAN said that what he was trying to point out was that if they specially trained a stoker, they did not degrade the artificer engineer by putting this man over him, but they did degrade the artificer engineer, because he had no hope of promotion.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he accepted the explanation though he did not agree with it; but he must point out that the actual words of the hon. Member, however, were that the artificer would be degraded by receiving orders from a man drawn from the lowest ranks of life. The lower rank of life had nothing to do with it. The question was whether he was fit to do his duty on the ship. The hon. Member had said it was degrading the artificer because he was not receiving the promotion he would otherwise receive. That was a mistake. He had not had the time nor the opportunity of ascertaining what was going to happen. The First Lord had said more than once that there was no question of diminishing the proportion of warrants allotted to engine-room artificers. The hon. Member had said it would be a great injury to them because they were skilled in every kind of trade and had gone through the engineering shop. But that was not how things happened at all. These were young men of twenty-two and twenty-three many of whom had been gas engineers, bicycle engineers, and the like. They were not examined in engineering generally and applied science as was suggested, but only to see whether they were competent in their own trade. A man came from London who had been engaged in brazing bicycles. He was given a certain examination as to brazing, fitting, and working to gauge, and so on, and showed that he was in the opinion of the examiners competent in those trades. It did not necessarily follow that he was a competent engineer on board a complicated box of machines like a ship in the Royal Navy. From the day he went on board he was a learner—learning the whole trade of repairing and running marine engines and the immensely complicated machinery on board a ship of war. He could not help smiling at some of the statements to which the hon. Member, despite his engineering knowledge, had committed himself.

*MR. C. DUNCAN: I smile at you just the same.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said the hon. Member said they were not as wise as they ought to be, because they did not remember that they could not repair engines while they were running. He thought he was taking a little advantage of the Committee. The "Dreadnought" the other day came round from Plymouth to Portland running under the exhaust steam from her auxiliary engines only. There was plenty of work for these artificers when the main engines of the ship were not running at all, and there was always very important work to be done by the engine-room artificer whether the main engines were running or not. Let him say a word on behalf of a class whom the hon. Member treated rather cavalierly. He hoped the Committee really understood what the problem was about the stokers. They were a most admirably conducted class. They went in at an early age and went through a very onerous course of stoking. They were first trained on shore and then at sea. There were 32,000 in the Navy and the whole avenue of promotion was shut to them. The hon. Member for Barrow said they wanted more wages. He did not dispute that. He only wished that more hon. Members had seen the class of work which the stokers did, because it was very onerous indeed. Three or four years ago it was proposed to give a certain proportion of those men an opportunity of acquiring further knowledge which would enable them to take charge of engines at sea. The right hon. Gentleman had said that these men were going to be taken out of the stoke-hole and made artificers. It should not be overlooked that the qualified stoker mechanicians had to serve five years before they could attain warrant officer rank. He thought the man who had served first as stoker, then as mechanician, and, with the approval of all his superior officers, had qualified for warrant rank, was entitled to the full reward of his labours. He could not see what injustice that would be to any other person on board ship. He hoped the Committee would not allow themselves to be misled by what had been said by some hon. Members on this subject. He agreed with the First Lord of the Admiralty when he said that if they were going to upset the new system it was no use doing it in the way which had been suggested. They had a tremendous weapon in their hands which had served them well in the past, and those who were acquainted with the past history of the Board of the Admiralty knew what difficulties and dangers of this kind had brought to the country. He thought every hon. Member would admit that, if they wished to take any action in regard to the policy of the Board of the Admiralty, it was neither in the interests of the country or the Navy itself, nor was it consistent with the dignity of this House, that it should be done by what was in effect a vote of censure upon the Admiralty. The remedy was in their own hands. If they had not got the Board of the Admiralty that they ought to have, let them have one which would more accurately represent the opinions of hon. Members. But let not the House of Commons try to do the work of the Board of Admiralty, because so surely as Members of that House attempted to do that so surely would they fail, so surely would they exaggerate existing evils, so surely would they bring the House into contempt, and so surely would they injure the great service which stood between the country and disaster.

*MR. BEAUCHAMP (Suffolk, Lowestoft) said that nobody would gainsay the statement that the training of officers was one of the most important questions of naval administration. In time of war they would have to rely upon the *personnel* as well as the material. They might have the best ships which the ingenuity of the naval architect could produce. They might be armed with guns of the greatest power and precision, they might even be outrivalled by their enemy in these things, but there remained the human element which must always be one of the determining factors in war. A high state of efficiency in the *personnel* was of even greater importance than the perfection of the material. It was this consideration which led to the introduction of the new scheme. The change from sail to steam, from muzzle-loaders to breech-loaders and quick-firing guns, changes which had converted a modern warship into a huge engine room, full of complicated machinery and mechanical contrivances of all kinds, necessitated an improved and advanced education and for this the scheme provided. It was no hastily formed plan, but a matured scheme which recognised that every naval officer should have a complete knowledge of the motive powers of the ship he was called upon to handle in time of peace and would have to fight in time of war. The scheme was in its infancy and some years must elapse before they could judge whether it fulfilled all that was expected of it by its authors. Its essential principle was that all were to be taken from the same stock, and at the same age all to enter through the same door, and all to share the same training in the initial stages of their naval life. Lord Tweedmouth had said it was the intention of the present Board to give the new policy a fair trial and to wait and watch its operations and to make any changes therein that time and experience showed to be necessary. The hon. Member for King's Lynn had described the scheme in 1903 that so far from being a sudden revolution it was a gradual change which could be arrested, hastened, or altered at any point. What could a Committee of inquiry do? They would have no fresh data to go upon and they would lack the materials upon which to form a definite opinion on the merits or demerits of the scheme as a whole, and he was glad the First Lord had decided not to grant an inquiry.

*SIR IVOR HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.) expressed his extreme regret that the First Lord of the Admiralty had opposed an absolute *non possumus* to the request for an inquiry into certain matters which had been very ably placed before the Committee. He was surprised at such an attitude from the right hon. Gentleman when he remembered the valuable service which he had rendered to the Army by calling for an inquiry at a time when he was not in a position of

Ministerial responsibility. He could not believe that in so short a period he had altogether changed the views he then held. No one could have listened to the very able speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon without realising that there were possibly points of misunderstanding which might by a little inquiry be very easily cleared up. He, therefore, hoped that before the debate terminated a wiser tone might be adopted than was to be found in the absolute refusal of inquiry with which his hon. friend's request had been met. His object in rising was to draw attention to the feeling of grievance and uneasiness which existed in a part of the Naval force of which he was able to speak from personal knowledge, having been associated with it on active service on two occasions and having had several years' association with it in time of peace—he alluded to the Royal Marines. They were seriously affected by the changes introduced into the Navy in recent years, and at the present moment they seemed to be threatened, if not with extinction, at least with that process of gradual elimination which caused very great uneasiness to all who admired efficiency. There had been many inquiries directed to the question of the way in which the Royal Marines had been affected by those changes. The hon. Member for King's Lynn last year pressed that the Minority Report of the Committee which had inquired into the working of the scheme should be laid before the House. Admiral Douglas' Committee consisted of eight Naval officers and one Marine officer. It might have been expected that the result of that Commission's inquiry would not be an unanimous Report. The Marine officer finding himself in a minority had to make a Report of his own. That Report had never been published. In his opinion and in that of persons of far greater experience than himself in regard to the Naval service it was desirable that the views of the Marine branch should be made known. When the Secretary to the Admiralty was asked a Question on this subject by the hon. Member for Dulwich on 23rd May last year, the reply was that the Board had not decided whether the Minority Report should be published or not. He did not know whether the Committee would be informed by the present Secretary to the Admiralty that the condition of cogitation was still going on. It was highly desirable that a definite answer should be given as to whether the views of the Marine officer who sat on that important Committee would be made known or not. Reference had been made by the hon. Member for the Blackfriars Division to the Memorandum published in November, 1905, which dealt at some length with the changes affecting the Royal Marines. He had read the Memorandum with great care, and could only characterise it as being of the most astounding and misleading nature he had ever read in any Blue-book. A precedent was sought for placing the Royal Marines under naval executive officers, and it was found in the eighteenth century in the appointment of two distinguished admirals to honorary positions in the corps. That could hardly form a precedent for that which was now being done. But if there was any doubt whether that precedent was a good one or not the records of the House would dispose of it, for it was in obedience to a Resolution of the House that the Lords-Commissioners of the Admiralty took into consideration a recommendation of the House of Commons in 1833 to appropriate to other purposes the sinecures which were given to the naval officers appointed to those honorary positions. It was a bad thing to quote a precedent which would not bear examination. They were told it might be necessary to make slight alterations in detail in order to adapt the naval lieutenant to the position of captain in the Royal Marines. It was considered that subaltern officers of Marines could be dispensed with, and that the duties of such officers might be carried out by warrant officers. Anybody who had had experience in military duty would deny that the duties which were legitimately placed on commissioned officers could be efficiently carried out by warrant officers. If it were otherwise, what would be the sense of promoting men from warrant rank to commission rank unless by giving that promotion they could get something from which the service could derive some benefit? They were informed that the naval officer qualified for military duties would be thoroughly able to undertake the duties of captain in the Royal Marines. It was not mere qualification in certain duties that was necessary in order to produce efficiency in a special arm. A high standard of efficiency depended upon the spirit and the tradition of a whole corps, and that could only exist where it was maintained by an efficient body of officers animated by that spirit and tradition. If they took away from the Royal Marines, or any other of His Majesty's armed forces, their own officers, it would be found that there would be a sensible deterioration in the whole efficiency of the corps. They were told also that this distinguished corps, which for 200 years had been employed wherever the British flag had been seen, and which bore the most honourable record and the proudest motto in His Majesty's service, had in the past been divided up and had served in ships where there were no Marine officers. If it were Parliamentary to express his view on that statement he would like to do it, but he could not. He would only state that out of 8,500 Marines who were annually embarked on ships, one-third only were employed in ships without their own officers. Special and most stringent conditions were laid down as to the selection of these men. No man in the second class of character and conduct could be included, and if a man by some mischance fell into the second class of conduct while so employed he had to be immediately removed into a ship where there was a Marine officer. Could anything be more conclusive of the fact that the Admiralty had regarded it as one of the secrets of efficiency in the Marine Corps that there were those officers who could bring them up when the men, unfortunately, fell away from the high standard? They were told that no regimental system had existed in the Marines at all. He was proud to be able to contradict that from his own knowledge. For a whole year on active service he served side by side in the same corps with officers and men of the Royal Marines, and he had never known any corps which possessed such a thorough regimental system as the Royal Marines. The fact that there was uneasiness at present not only among the officers of this distinguished corps, but also in some part of the country which had for generations furnished recruits for the corps, was enough in his opinion to induce the First Lord of the Admiralty to modify the attitude which he had taken up in refusing all inquiry into this grievance. He would conclude by quoting the memorable words used by the greatest of all naval administrators, Lord St. Vincent, regarding this famous corps—

> "I never knew an appeal to them for honour, courage, or loyalty that they did not more than realise my highest expectation. If ever any hour of real danger should come to England, the Royal Marines will be found the country's sheet anchor."

He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consent to some inquiry, at any rate, with regard to the effect of recent changes upon this important branch of His Majesty's Service.

MR. CROYDON MARKS (Cornwall, Launceston) said that engineers who wished to enter His Majesty's Naval Service only desired that they should be allowed to continue to train themselves at their own expense, instead of being trained in the dockyards and on board men-of-war at the public expense. Engineers who had trained themselves to a high state of efficiency felt that they were being ignored and superseded by others of less knowledge than themselves, who were placed in authority over them. He contended that an engineer joining the Royal Navy should not find that he had joined a branch of the Service which was regarded as inferior. Out of every eight officers in the British Navy three must be engineers. At Dartmouth not one in ten cadets desired to become an engineer. That being the case, it was absurd to attempt to make specialists by compulsion rather than by choice. They could not get men to do their duty properly and efficiently simply because it was the work of their life. Naturally, an engineer did not want to be anything but an engineer, and all he objected to was having another officer, of whom he knew nothing, placed over his men. Under the present entry men who had specialised at the age of twenty-one would be placed in charge of the engine room over men who had a highly finished training and great practical experience as engineers. Under the existing system engineers outside the Service felt that the door of entry to the Royal Navy was absolutely closed against them, that the expense of training was too great, and that the Admiralty drew their engineers from a different class of society than formerly for this important branch of the Service. It was all very well to speak of £75 a year as being a paltry sum; but that meant all the difference between comfort and discomfort in the homes from which the best engineers in the past had been drawn. Then, it must not be forgotten that engineering was not a stationary science. A few years ago there was nothing but the long cylinder boilers. These had given place to tubular boilers, and high pressure expansion engines had given place to turbines. He believed that the time was coming when gas would be the motive power, and the man who had specialised ten years before by compulsion would be out of it. They must have engineers who would appreciate the future as well as the past, and not those who would be continually looking forward to the time when they would get on deck for promotion. In regard to the mechanicians, he did not believe that the stokers desired to be drawn into that particular class. He knew that complaints were made from both branches of the Service in regard to that. Stokers up to twenty-six and a half years of age were put to work they knew nothing about, and after three months filing, drilling, and chipping they were supposed to have learned a trade, which otherwise would have required a training for a period of six and three-quarter years, in order that they might subsequently take charge of the engine-room in place of men who had come into the Service from the outside, and who had been trained at their own cost and not at the expense of the country. A man who had been taken out of the stoke-hole and put into the engine-room as a mechanician had not had the fundamental training which would give him an aptitude for engineering work. The best engineer in the merchant service was not the man who was alleged to be capable of repairing engines, but the man who would take care that repairs were not necessary. He knew what to do to avoid the trouble of repairs; and a similar class of men in the Royal Navy would save the country large sums of money. If any hon. Member desired that an inquiry should be made it ought not to be held that he wished to be a censor of the Board of Admiralty. He took it that the Board of Admiralty were the servants of the country. He spoke on this subject as knowing the opinion of the whole engineering profession; and they were absolutely opposed to what had been done. If he were to decline to ask for an inquiry lest it should be said that he was disloyal to the Government, then, he contended, he would rather be disloyal to the Government than to his convictions as an engineer. He hoped his hon. friend would press for an inquiry without any fear as to whether they were going to offend anyone in high position at the Admiralty. He hoped that the First Lord would see his way, through the Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, to make some suggestion which would go some way towards a recognition that there was a great grievance at the present time in the engine-room. It must be remembered that the engine-room was the vital part of the ship and that there were 32,000 men in the stoke-holes of the Navy who were seeking promotion. They had been told that a good many had got it; but all that that amounted to was that 100 per annum were made into mechanicians. That was not the kind of promotion they desired, because there were other duties which they could well perform without being taught a new trade. He therefore suggested that the First Lord should give way or speak in a more conciliatory tone than he had adopted at the beginning of the debate.

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Dr. MACNAMARA, Camberwell, N.) said he must congratulate the mover and seconder of the reduction on the great good temper and moderation displayed in their speeches. Further, he was quite sure that the whole desire of the Committee in these discussions was to protect the great Service upon which, in the main, the safety and well-being of these realms depended. The problem of the entry and training of the naval officer had been a matter of the closest consideration for many years past, and it would not be fair to say that any change had been sudden, although it might in its nature be revolutionary. A Committee under Admiral Shadwell sat in 1870; another, of which Admiral Rice was Chairman, sat in 1875; a third, of which Mr. Gordon was Chairman, sat in 1877; and a fourth, under Admiral Luard, sat in 1886. Anyone who read the Reports of these Committees must be struck by the extent to which all these Committees had foreshadowed in general terms the scheme which was now, as the result of Lord Selborne's Committee's Report in 1902, the scheme in being. Admiral Luard's Committee raised the age of entry from between twelve and thirteen and a half years of age, to between thirteen and fourteen and a half. Then came the changes introduced by Lord Goschen in 1896–97. He made a very considerable change in the age of training, probably not from any scientific or academic reason, but largely because of the shortage of the men on the lieutenants' list which was inadequate for the necessities of the rapidly increasing fleet. Something had to be done to shorten up the time from entry as cadet to sub-lieutenant. The changes made were—the age of entry was raised to between fourteen and fifteen and a half; the "Britannia" course was shortened from two years to one year and four months; the period of service afloat as cadet was reduced from twelve months to eight months, and the period of service afloat as midshipman was reduced from three and a half years to three years. Then came Lord Selborne's great scheme which was launched in December, 1902. The genius of Lord Selborne's scheme was the principle of common early entry and common early training for all naval officers. Prior to that three classes of Executives, Engineers, and Marines had entered on totally different conditions and at different ages, and had been trained on wholly different lines. From 1903 onwards all were taken from the same stock, at the same age, and all entered through the same door and received the same training in the initial stages of their naval life. In his celebrated memorandum of December, 1902, Lord Selborne, said—

> "In the old days it sufficed if a naval officer was a seaman. Now, he must be a seaman, a gunner, a soldier and a man of science as well. It is not only that machinery driven by electric, hydraulic, or steam power is every year becoming more complicated in character and multiplying in form, and that therefore a more extensive education in applied science is necessary for specialised officers, but in various ways the need of a more general scientific training has become apparent."

The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord had told the Committee what happened. Entries took place three times a year, anybody could apply, the boys went before the Interview Committee armed with reports from school, and after passing a qualifying educational and medical examination the first Lord selected the number needed from a list of those who had been most successful. Perhaps he ought to add that thirteen nominations annually were placed at the disposal of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Interview Committee consisted of a flag officer, an experienced schoolmaster, a second naval officer either of flag rank or a post-captain with some experience of training work, and a representative of the first Lord. He would like to quote just two extracts from many eulogistic reports of civil members whose opinions would have weight with the Committee. There was boundless testimony from several members as to the adequacy of this system for getting at the natural capacity of the boy. Canon Lyttelton said—

> "I have no doubt that for estimating the all-round powers of a boy this informal conversation, coupled with the paper test afterwards and the time at Osborne, affords the best method of examination yet devised in England; it is greatly to be desired that the entrance to the Army should be regulated on similar lines."

Mr. Arthur Acland, Vice-President of the Council of Education in 1892–95 said—

> "The plan that has been adopted at the Admiralty with regard to those boys who wish to become naval cadets appears to me, after having taken my share in interviewing 170 boys, to be a complete success for the purposes that you have in view."

He was a most profound believer in this system of selection. It killed the crammer and they got at the real native capacity of the boy by this system far better than by a month of written examinations. He saw the system at work on 15th June, and as an old schoolmaster with thirty years teaching experience behind him he was very greatly impressed. He most cordially endorsed this system of selecting the boys if it was desired to get at the truth of their real native capacity.

MR. BELLAIRS asked how long these boys were before the Committee, was it about twenty minutes, and what was the percentage of the rejections. Was it about 60 per cent. ?

*DR. MACNAMARA said that while he was there the boys were before the Interview Committee fifteen or twenty minutes. What the percentage of rejections was he did not know. The boys selected then went to Osborne for two years, and then they went down to Dartmouth for two years. During this time the weeding-out process was continued, so that only the very best were taken for the Navy. He might shortly say that 30 per cent. of the time was devoted to engineering, 50 per cent. to mathematics and general subjects, and 20 per cent. to executive seamanship. For the last eight months of that time they went on a training cruiser, where their education in applied science, engineering, navigation, and seamanship, was continued under conditions that made it more directly professional; they also learned something of gunnery and torpedo, and of the general duties of a Naval officer. The system was now in full working order, there were 900 cadets in two colleges, and two training cruisers, the "Cumberland" and the "Cornwall." At the end of the cruise a final passing out examination was held which determined the place of the cadet on the Navy list. They were then rated midshipmen and distributed to sea-going ships for three years sea service. The first batch of cadets trained in this way passed into the fleet in May of this year as midshipmen. It would be observed that the cadets passed into the Navy at seventeen and a half years of age. With regard to the cost to the parents, it would probably be of interest to hon. Members who had raised this question if he now compared the cost of the new system with that of the old. Under the new system a boy entered between the ages of twelve years and eight months and thirteen. He served four years at the colleges, two-thirds of a year in the training cruiser, and slightly over three years as a midshipman. The fees payable were £75 for the first four years and £50 for the remainder. If he added to the fees of the four years at the colleges £35 or £40 a year on account of railway expenses, outfit, holiday expenses, subscriptions to sports fund, payments for washing, etc., they would be fairly within the mark. Therefore, up to the close of the midshipman's career the parent would get off with an aggregate of from £600 to £650. But the Admiralty reserved the power of selecting from the cadets seeking entry a limited number of boys who were admitted at £40 a year, they being the sons of officers of the Navy, Army, or Marines, or of civil officers under the Admiralty. But he had looked into that matter and he found that out of each entry of sixty-five to seventy boys the number who entered at £40 a year were only three or four. Under the old system, the old executive officer entered at the age of from fourteen and a half to fifteen and a half years. The training consisted of one year on the "Britannia" one-third of a year on the training cruiser, and three and one-third years as a midshipman, four years and eight months in all. The fees payable were £75 for the first year and one-third, and £50 a year for the remainder. If he made the same kind of calculation here as he made in the other case, he found that the parent got off, under the old system with a payment of about £300, but hon. Members would observe that he had to maintain the boy himself for something like two years, which would represent the period which he would now spend at Osborne, and he would pay a considerable fee for the boy to be crammed. So that after all, the present system was probably no dearer than the old, so far as that class of officer was concerned. With regard to the engineer officers under the old system, the engineer cadets entered between fourteen and a half and sixteen and a half years of age. They spent five years at Keyham at an annual fee of £40 a year, that gave an aggregate fee of £200. If he applied the same method of calculation, and added £25 a year for other charges, the parent had to pay between £325 and £350; but here again he had to maintain the boy for two years, a time which he would now, under this system, spend at Osborne. Then there was the case of the Marine officer.

MR. BARNES: You have forgotten the man who had gone in through the dockyard school.

*DR. MACNAMARA said he had not forgotten, but he proposed to deal with that point a little later on. Coming next to the question of the Marine officers, the Royal Marine Artillery officer under the old system entered for that service between sixteen and eighteen years of age and spent two years at Greenwich, no fees being payable on his account. The Royal Marine Light Infantry officer came into the service at from seventeen to nineteen years of age, spending one year at Greenwich where no fees were payable. His hon. and gallant friend the Member for Monmouthshire was under a misapprehension as to the Minority Report of the Admiral Douglas Committee's not being published. That Report was published three years ago. He was very keen that this fine force of which he and everybody else was very proud should not be abolished, and he certainly hoped that they would not with their fine record behind them, a record which included gallant services in the tribal wars, the Crimea, the Indian Mutiny, Graspan, and the Modder River. The total cost to the State, taking out the parents' contributions, and the pay and naval rating of those who were liable to mobilisation, was £126 for the boy at Osborne, and £115 per boy at Dartmouth. The total cost to the State was £95,000, to the parents, £56,000, and to naval rating and pay, £25,000, making a total of £175,000 or £225 per boy while they were at these colleges. He had seen the scheme at work at Osborne and at Dartmouth, and was enthusiastic admirer of it, but he did not deny that it had a weak place. It was weak in one point, and that was whether the area of selection was not restricted unnecessarily. But that was no new feature, it had always been characteristic of the system. Theoretically, anybody could apply; in practice the applications were severely restricted by the fairly heavy financial obligations. It was no new feature, so far as this scheme was concerned. The Navy had been called in the past the poor man's service. There was nothing in that service corresponding to the "crack" regiments in the Army, and he hoped there never would be. It was, no doubt, the fact that Lord Nelson was the son of a Norfolk parson, and was one of eleven children, so that in these days, and under this system, he probably could never have become a cadet at Osborne. It was a serious question for consideration whether or not the net might be cast wider, and it would ill become him, who had himself risen from the ranks, if he were not anxious to see something done in a matter of this sort. This splendid part of the service, however, was so well trained and so well equipped for the work it had to do that he did not mind admitting that, though he had the most pronounced democratic tendencies, he would not touch it except with the profoundest possible care, lest he might do something to injure it. At any rate, he thought it was a matter for consideration whether they might not be able to widen the entry by a reduction of fees, or by some scholarship scheme, or whether they might not sweep away the school fees altogether in order to put the thing on a broad and general basis. That was no doubt a matter for serious consideration. There was a feature of this scheme which he admitted could only be tested as the result of actual experience. It had been mentioned again that afternoon by several hon. Gentlemen. The question was whether a system of common training did not sacrifice high specialisation, particularly as far as the engineers were concerned. Some confusion of thought, he believed, had arisen from the use of that blessed word "interchangeability." There was here no interchangeability of particular functions. There was a high specialisation with a faculty to assume executive control such as he thought we must have in these days of complicated machinery. He did not think his hon. friend the Member for Blackfriars was right when he said the Naval officer of the future would be a jack-of-all-trades and master of none. What he himself thought about the Naval officer of the future was that he would know something about everything and everything about something. But in any case, whatever might be the future of this great scheme, to which so much interest was attached, and which was watched with so much anxiety, the Admiralty on 1st May issued a general circular, in which they stated that—

> "The details of the scheme would be subject to revision as experience might show to be necessary."

He need not deal with the subject of the boy mechanician or the boy artificer. The First Lord had fully gone into them. There was one point with regard to the mechanicians, and that was the case put forward by the hon. Member for Barrow in regard to the unfortunate occurrence on board the "Irresistible." The hon. Gentleman's contention was that a mechanician had been put to open a valve which ought to have been opened by an engine-room artificer, with the result that the place was flooded. The hon. Member put the case as evidence of the Admiralty's desire to elbow out the engine-room artificer and put in the mechanician. The mechanician was specially trained to watch and to drive engines, and that set the artificer free for his highly-skilled tool work. In the particular case of the "Irresistible" it was not true to say that nobody but an engine-room artificer should have opened the valve. Anybody who had any association with that work, either a first or second class stoker, might have been put to do it, subject to proper supervision, and to its being seen that the other valves were properly closed. The difficulty arose, not because of the particular man put on to open the valve, but because they were slack in their organisation, and because there was not sufficient care in regard to the operations, which required that other valves under the surface of the water should be kept closed. That was no evidence of the truth of the contention that the artificer was being supplanted by the mechanician. The report of the inquiry set forth that those responsible for the operations had shown carelessness, that there was not the right organisation, that there was slackness, and those responsible would be dealt with accordingly. He thought he had now made it quite clear that they were not putting the mechanician to do the engine-room artificer's work, as his hon. friend seemed to put it. That was not the case at all. He hoped that after these explanations, and having covered the points which had arisen since the First Lord had addressed the Committee, they would now proceed to give them Vote 5.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) said that that was one of the occasions when the Members of both front benches were agreed, although the hon. Member for King's Lynn thought that that was necessarily a nefarious state of affairs. There was only one point in connection with what the hon. Member had said on which he would like to make an observation. He thought that the most serious criticism made at all that day with reference to the scheme was that the area from which selection was made was somewhat narrow, and that the sons of the working classes were in many cases shut out. Therefore, he welcomed the hope which the hon. Gentleman had thrown out that by some system of reducing the expenses it might be possible for a limited number of entries to be made where the financial qualifications would not be a serious hindrance. He hoped that the First Lord might be able to persuade the Chancellor of the Exchequer to do what was necessary in the matter, and if he did he was sure that he would get some support from that side of the House. In answer to the hon. Member who had moved the reduction, it had been stated that it could be told from the reports that this scheme was working admirably, and he did not think that it was too much to ask that they should not tear it up by the roots after it had been only five years in operation. He hoped that it was not intended to thrust the demand too far for an alteration of the scheme, which was approved of by almost every authority that he had consulted. If the hon. Gentleman forced this reduction to a division, he should feel it his duty to support the Government.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) said he desired to support the Motion for reduction, but not without some words of explanation of his reasons. Anyone who would weaken the system of discipline in the Navy, our first line of defence, would deserve the censure of that House, and of the whole nation, but in this matter he confessed to a prejudice in favour of his own trade. Once an engineer, always an engineer. Where he believed there was a real and legitimate root of discontent in regard to the present system of promotion, was the feeling of the engineers that the stokers, who were in fact a lower grade of their own profession, were being promoted over the heads of their superiors. The case did not at all resemble the promotion of members of another and a distinct skilled trade, such as the carpenters. All on that side of the House, and also the most respected occupants of the front Government bench, were working steadily for the decasualising of labour. That process, the organising of labour, necessarily involved a certain amount of discipline and recognition of ranks in the trades concerned. The naval authorities should not, without strong reasons, do anything to destroy that sense and system. For this reason he supported the hon. Member for Blackfriars, but at the same time he must repeat the caution against any weakening of the absolutely necessary discipline of the Navy. There should, in his opinion, be an engineer member of the selecting or interviewing committee.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 90; Noes, 205. (Division List No. 180.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baldwin, Stanley
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J Williams (Devonp'rt)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Curran, Peter Francis
Dillon, John
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Fell, Arthur
Fenwick, Charles
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Kean, John
Marks, G Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Murphy, John (Kerry, East)
Nannetti, Joseph P
Napier, T. B.
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Grady, J
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Snowden, P.
Stanier, Beville
Stanley, Albert (Staffs, N.W.)
Steadman, W. C.
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walters, John Tudor
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. George Roberts and Mr. Charles Duncan.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex F.
Ainsworth John Stirling
Allen Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)

Barlow,Sir John E.(Somerset)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry,Redmond J.(Tyrone,N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Benn,W(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. M. H.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Coates, Major E. F. (Lewisham)
Collins,Sir Wm.J(S.Pancras,W.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett,C H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Cremer, Sir William Randal
Crossley, William J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duckworth, James
Edwards,Sir Francis (Radnor)
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Sir Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Sir Daniel Ford
Gooch,George Peabody (Bath)
Gooch,Henry Cubitt(Peckham)
Gordon, J.
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harcourt,Robert V. (Montrose
Harmsworth,R.L (Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Col.Sir Ivor (Mon.,S)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hope,James Fitzalan(Sheffield)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kavanagh, Walter M.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamont, Norman
Law,Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants,Fareham
Lever,A. Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Sir Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J M.((FalkirkBg'hs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, Sir George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Magnus, Sir Philip
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Massie, J.
Meehan,Francis E (Leitrim,N.
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlebrook, William
Molteno, Percy Allport
Montagu, Hon. E. S.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morpeth, Viscount
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray,Capt.Hn.A.C.(Kincard
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,Charles N(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Percy
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Philipps, Col Ivor (S'thampton
Phillips, John (Longford, S.)
Pirie, Duncan V
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Sir Robert J.(Norfolk,.E)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Rt. Hon. Walter
Russell, T. W.
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L (Cleveland)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col.Thos. Myles
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H(Ashton-under-Lyne
Seely, Colonel
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B)
Sheffield,SirBerekley GeorgeD.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stavelay-Hill, Henry(Staff'sh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thorne, G.R.(Wolverhampton)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Valentia, Viscount
Vivian, Henry
Wadsworth, J.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Waring, Walter
Warner,Thomas Courtenay, T.
Wason, RtHn.E(Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, Sir George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry(Halifax)
Whittaker,RtHn.Sir ThomasP.
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. G. G. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H.(Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh.,N.)
Wilson, P. W.(St.Pancras,S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Joseph Pease and Master of Elibank.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. £1,334,600, Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances.

*MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth) said he wanted to raise the question of the Greenwich age pensioners, but there were only about six minutes left and that was nothing like adequate for so important a subject in which so many Members were interested. He did not want to prevent the Vote being obtained, so he suggested that if his right hon. friend would receive a deputation of those Members who were interested in the subject they might have a fuller opportunity of discussing it, and he hoped they would be able to arrive at a conclusion which would be satisfactory to all parties interested.

Mr. McKENNA said the Scottish Members had been promised half the evening, and he did not think it would be possible to do justice to this very important question. If hon. Members who were particularly interested would be good enough to make representations to him on a day suitable to themselves at the Admiralty he thought on the whole, on a technical subject of this kind, they would get better results than by debating it now, and he hoped the Committee would agree to the suggestion.

***Mr. BRAMSDON** said that a great many persons throughout the country were interested in the subject, and it would be inadvisable, perhaps, to have a meeting with the First Lord unless they could do so in a public manner. Perhaps he would agree to reporters being present.

Mr. McKENNA said that that also at first sight would appear to be reasonable. Perhaps his hon. friend, however, would not ask a pledge from him on that point.

Mr. JENKINS (Chatham) said that no reference whatever had been made to questions affecting petty officers, seamen or stokers. If the right hon. Gentleman would receive a deputation he would withhold his remarks.

Vote agreed to.

3. £868,800, Half-Pay and Retired Pay.

4. £377,400, Civil Pensions and Gratuities.

Resolutions to be reported.

Mr. Bramsdon.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1908–9.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £14,998, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1909, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Fishery Board for Scotland and for Grants in Aid of Piers or Quays."

Sir ARTHUR BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs) moved a reduction of £100 and said that it seemed to him that the local question of fishing in the Moray Firth had drifted into being treated as an International one, but that was no reason why it should pass away from the consideration of a Scottish Committee, for the basis of international law and international comity was international Conventions, and these were as open to the observation of the Committee as they were to that of Dover House or the Foreign Office. What the fishermen of Caithness desired was to know how they stood in respect of their rights to claim the closing of the Firth; three unanimous decisions in their favour had been given by the highest Court in Scotland, the first on 19th July, 1905, and one decision against them, viz., by the present Government, but whether that decision was unanimous or not, was unknown. The Conventions which affected the matter were but four, and even that number was reducible. First the Convention of August, 1839, between the Queen of England and the King of France; secondly, the Convention between Great Britain and Belgium in 1852; thirdly, the Convention between the Emperor of France and Great Britain in 1867; and, fourthly and lastly, the North Sea Convention between Great Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands. The first of these four Conventions, namely, that of 1839, was merged in and abrogated by the Convention of 1867. That between Belgium and ourselves was limited to reciprocal concession of the most favoured nation clause to each country. The sole point in the Convention of 1867 was practically limited to an agreement in respect of a three miles limit between the two signatory parties, France and Great Britain, on all their shores save one angle of France. The North Sea Convention declared that it referred solely to policing the waters of the North Sea. It recognised as between the parties to the Convention a three miles limit in all waters and in all cases. It set out how the line was to be drawn in bays not exceeding ten miles in breadth, in the case of larger bays it was silent, and in one case, and in one case only, in the neighbourhood of the Firth, it made a special delimitation, *i.e.*, between Duncansbay Head and the Southern Point of South Ronaldshay. There was not in the Convention a word or a suggestion that as long as subjects and foreigners were treated alike a country did not retain the right to regulate the fisheries off its own coasts. There was not a word or a suggestion in the Convention that the Moray Firth was international waters. He wished to refer to how it was that the case came before the High Court of Appeal:—The Fisheries Board in 1890 by virtue of the powers conferred upon them by the Herring Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1889, and the Herring Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment Act in 1890, drew a line within which they ex- excluded from the Firth all trawlers from the Ord of Caithness to the Craghead in Banffshire, and again in 1892 under the same powers, drew a line from Duncansbay Head to Rattray Point, enclosing the entire Firth. Each signatory to the Convention received notice of that action of the Fishery Board, none demurred to it, all have tacitly respected it. On 18th March, 1907, the Secretary for Scotland said in that House—

> "For many years there have been no trawlers in the Moray Firth except the pseudo Norwegian Grimsby trawlers."

And that statement was unquestionably correct. The reason why the Grimsby trawlers registered under the Norwegian flag was because it was known that under the flag of any one of the Signatories to the Convention they could, and would have been excluded, for they, the Signatories, had accepted the action of the Fishery Board. The Signatories to the Convention never claimed to enter the Firth after its closure by the Fishery Board in 1892, but the Grimsby boats registered in Norway proceeded to do so, and in 1904 it was determined to take a test case to the High Court, which case he had had the honour of promoting. On 25th February, 1905, and he particularly directed the attention of the Committee to the date, the case of Peters *v.* Olsen came before the Sheriff-Substitute, in which case a Grimsby boat, registered at Stavanger in Norway, was found fishing four miles from shore in the Moray Firth. The Sheriff-Substitute acquitted the defendant and the case went before the High Court of Appeal and was adjudicated upon on 19th July, 1905, the Judges being unanimously in favour of a conviction and a justification of the Fishery Board. After this event he communicated with Lord Linlithgow, the late Secretary for Scotland, and before leaving office he (Lord Linlithgow) wrote to the Secretary of the Moray Firth Fisheries Association on 4th December, 1905, as follows—

> "That instructions have been issued with a view of the prosecution of persons guilty of illegal fishing as interpreted by the High Court."

And thus it was left on the record of the late Government that they were determined to stand by the linesman of the North. When a change of Government came it was found that the new Government were continuing the policy of their predecessors and in August, 1906, the "Mortensen" case was heard with a similar result, and finally the Government having selected three test cases pressed them for final decision before the High Court of Appeal who delivered voluminous judgments thereon. Each of the twelve Judges of the High Court of Appeal had a copy of the Convention in his hand; he took care of that. The judgement of Lord Kyllachie was as follows—

> "There is certainly nothing in the Convention which in the least conflicts with the right of the several contracting nations to impose each of them "within' its territorial limits (whatever these are) restrictions universally applicable against injurious practices or modes of fishing, such as are by this statute and bye-law imposed here."

Thereupon ensued the Elgin prosecutions by the Government on 31st January, 1907. Heavy sentences of fines and imprisonment were imposed, followed within three days by what might fairly be termed a bolt from the blue, in the form of a remission of the fines, release of the prisoners, and the restoration of the gear. But now the Answer of the

Secretary for Scotland to his (Sir Arthur Bignold's) Question as to foreign trawling in the Moray Firth, though the Secretary did not in his reply name the Firth (26th March, 1908) was—

> " That the Government, for reasons of international comity, are not prepared to institute proceedings against foreign trawlers engaged in trawling outside the limit of territorial waters recognised by International Convention."

The Moray Firth was not recognised in any Convention as international waters. He claimed the right of Great Britain over the Moray Firth on the same terms of argument as France established her rights over the Bay of Chaleur and the Granville Bay, the United States Chesapeake Bay, England the Bristol Channel, Norway at the Lofodens, and Newfoundland the Bay of Conception. There was no such thing as an international three-miles limit; the limit was an arrangement, at will, between nations. Spain and Portugal claimed a six-miles limit, Austria and Italy a five-miles limit, and between the Signatories to the Convention a three-miles limit was agreed to. No European Government in modern times had formally defined the absolute extent of the neighbouring sea it claimed as pertaining to it. Lord Salisbury, 6th May, 1895, had said—

> " Great care had been taken not to name three miles as the territorial limit."

Lord Chancellor Herschell, whose surpassing ability would be remembered when they were dead and forgotten, said—

> " He was far from saying three miles was to be the limit of territorial waters."

Lord Halsbury added—

> "They took care specially to avoid any measurements."

A right to fish in the Moray Firth had never been claimed by the Signatories to the Convention, but now to the utter consternation and dismay of the dwellers on the shores of the Firth the Government professed to have discovered that the foreigner had a right to do what he, the foreigner, himself had considered beyond his international privileges. The position of the twelve Judges of the High Court was unassailable under any Convention in existence, or any precedent of international comity. All along the North Sea and on its bosom had arisen races of men to make their mark in the world. Was their industry to be starved and ruined by the catchwords " International Comity " ? He would never believe it, but he did believe that, if Scotland were Scotland still, as she would be but for England's Ministers, the linesmen of the North would not now be left to perish.

Motion made, and Question proposed," " That a sum, not exceeding £14,898, be granted for the said service."—(*Sir Arthur Bignold.*)

*MR. WILLIAMSON (Elgin and Nairn) said the House had listened with very great interest to the speech of the hon. Member for the Wick Boroughs. He had put before the House with great clearness the historical aspect of the question, but there were other grounds of a more or less local character which compelled those who represented constituencies in the north of Scotland to urge the Government to maintain the condition of exclusion in the Moray Firth, which had existed in regard to British trawlers and to use every effort and to take steps to close the Forth entirely to foreigners also. One of those grounds was the destruction which took place by this method of fishing by trawling in inshore waters. The Fishery Board for Scotland had made some experimental trawling in the Moray Firth and had found that over 70 per cent. of the fish taken were unmarketable. The destruction in certain months of the year, particularly in the inshore waters, was very great, and he therefore wanted to urge that these bays and shallow waters should be protected from the destructive power of the trawlers. Then again trawl fishing ought not to be pursued where it was destructive to the interests and livelihood of other fishermen, and in these narrow waters like the Moray Firth the destruction to lines and nets was greater than in the open sea. The complaints in regard to damage to nets and lines had markedly increased. In 1906 the complaints numbered twenty-seven, but in 1907, there were no less than fifty-two, showing that the number had almost doubled in twelve months. Another indication of the destruction done by trawling was to be found in the number of prosecutions for offences committed in narrow waters. In 1906, there were thirty-eight prosecutions, while in 1907 there were 131, but it should be remembered that not half of the offenders were brought to trial. The third point which he wished to urge was that the Moray Firth had been selected by the Scottish Fishery Board, and their scientific advisers, for the conduct of certain scientific experiments. The results of those experiments had been very largely nullified by the presence in the Firth, not of British trawlers, but of a number of what might be described as poaching trawlers, owned in Grimsby, but masquerading under a foreign flag in order to catch fish by a method which in the prescribed water their own fellow-countrymen were precluded from adopting. There was much dissatisfaction among the fishermen on that account. A great deal had been said about the three mile limit. He believed that the owners of trawlers were very much afraid that if the Government made representations to the Governments of other nations in regard to the limit, the other nations might extend their territorial limits and so preclude British fishers from fishing round their coasts. He believed that that was largely why they feared Government action. There was a valid ground on which the Government could take action in this matter. In 1901 the British Government sent delegates to a convention at Christiania, at which Norway was represented. A resolution was passed unanimously declaring that when any Government undertook scientific investigations in the interest of fisheries in areas of sea such as the Moray Firth it was to be desired that methods should be adopted to remove such hindrances as might be caused to the carrying on of the investigations by the operations of trawlers. He thought, therefore, that apart from more debatable questions, such as extension of three mile limits, we had ground for going to the Norwegian Government, and saying that the operations of trawling vessels flying their flag were a nuisance, and that they were interfering with the investigations which were taking place in the Moray Firth. The Secretary for Scotland had given the assurance that the foreign Governments concerned would be communicated with with the view of taking such action as was suggested. He was very much afraid that the right hon. Gentleman was hampered in his action by opposition from other quarters in London, which precluded him from getting something done which 95 to 99 per cent. of the people of Scotland desired should be done, but which was stopped by the attitude of another Government Department. There was another very important matter. The Government ought to take an interest in the policy of men as well as matter, They had been debating for some time in the House what should be done to restore people to the land on small holdings, not because it was necessarily the cheapest way of tilling the land, but because it was best for the people and the nation as a whole, that the people should be attached to the land. The same question arose in connection with the fishing industry. If the Government were going to follow the policy of preventing the line fishermen from earning their livelihood in the small towns which they had built up along the coast by their thrift and enterprise, they would drive them to big ports like Aberdeen and Grimsby, where they would become not independent owners but the paid servants on weekly wages of the capitalists and companies. They ought rather to strive in every way to maintain that sturdy race of fishermen who had improved their position so much during the last fifty years, and to encourage them to earn their livelihood where they were born and brought up. There was yet another matter to which he wished to call the attention of the Secretary of Scotland, and that was with regard to the very great increase of late years in the size of fishing boats in use. There had been a remarkable change from sailing craft to steam-fishing vessels, and, consequently, a want of accommodation for them. In 1900 the number of steam drifters and liners was seventy; in 1907, it was 508. And he would point out to the Grimsby trawlers that these boats were built by the money of the fishermen themselves. and not that of capitalits. This increase ot these boats was apart from the increase of trawlers. The Moray Firth, with which he was connected, had added in 1907 no less than 101 steam-fishing vessels to her fleet, and the total now reached 250. When the boats were the old sailing-boats it was all very well for them when pursuing their calling to go to Aberdeen, Granton and English ports, but for two months of the year—December and January—the steam liners did not fish and the boats were laid up. However, as there was no suitable accommodation for them in their own small ports, such as Lossiemouth, a large number —he believed thirty-five—owned in that port, had t ogo to Inverness to be laid up. The owners of the boats had to do the repairs to them and to refit them at the cost of about £200 each, which amounted altogether to £7,000, all of which was spent in Inverness instead of at their own ports where they had built their homes. He thought they were entitled to a share of the grants which had been made for harbour improvement so that their own boats might be able to lie up in their own ports. He was afraid that a great deal of the £97,000 spent on harbour improvements by the Fishery Board had been spent upon ports that were unsuitable. There were many estuaries of rivers which could be dredged at little cost and made available for the safe laying up of these boats. He was sure the Scottish Members felt very keenly that they had not received with regard to the Moray Firth that strong line of support which as supporters of the Government and as representing the Scottish nation they were well entitled to expect.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs) said he cordially agreed to what had been said by the two previous speakers. Certainly he thought that the Moray Firth was in a most deplorable condition at present. Nobody knew whether the foreigners were legally there or not. The truth was the Government did not back up the Scottish law. The matter had been very carefully gone into. The late Lord Linlithgow, who was a personal friend of his own, and whose loss he would ever deplore, laid it down very distinctly as to whether these waters were to be preserved or not, and now since the present Government came in the whole question had been turned topsy-turvy and nobody knew where he was. It was a disgraceful anomaly that a British fisherman should be hauled out of a foreign trawler and prosecuted while the owner of the trawler went scot-free. Either the Moray Firth ought to be open to all or closed to all. The hon. Member for Wick had already quoted different waters which were preserved in France, Germany, Holland, and Denmark. These were broad waters without a three-mile limit, and there was no difficulty in carrying out the law there. As to the Grimsby trawlers flying a foreign flag, that was a controversial point, and had been bitterly resented by some of his English friends. However, he resented the use of a foreign flag by these trawlers. There was an excuse for it if they thought it was legal to go within the three-mile limit. What was wanted was a little backbone in the administration of Scotland. All this flabby work would not do. He did not think they should have a decision by the Judges of the High Court upset by a telegram from London. He wished that the Secretary for Foreign Affairs had been present, for he was sure that that right hon. Gentleman would have given the Scottish Members some sympathy and would have spurred on the Government to do something to solve this matter. He believed the right hon. Gentleman would yet do it, for in reply to a Question he put to the ForeignSecretary the other day the right hon. Gentleman said he hoped that within one year an arrangement with foreign nations would be satisfactorily concluded. If that were so, there would be an end to the difficulty, and nobody would welcome it more heartily than he. He was not there to annoy the Secretary for Scotland or hamper him in his work. Every Scottish Member, on whatever side he sat, was loyal to what he wanted, which was that Scotland should flourish. He hoped this anomaly would be speedily put an end to. He would leave the Moray Firth and the trawlers within the three-mile limit, and pass on to say something about the size of the nets used by the trawlers. He had been looking at the Report of the Fishery Board for this year, and found it stated there—

> "To those engaged in the fishing industry in Orkney and Shetland waters, the growing increase in the quantity of small haddocks landed is matter of concern. These haddocks are occasionally sold for manure."

The same thing might be said of the upper reaches of the Firth of Forth, where the circle net was in use. Many tons of immature herrings had been thrown away or sold for manure. That could not commend itself to the Secretary for Scotland. He was glad the Fishery Board were taking steps to inquire into the matter. Their next inquiry should be into the size of the nets used by the trawlers. The mesh should be limited to one inch or more, and not to a quarter of an inch as it was in some cases. Nobody wanted to catch these immature fish or to destroy their prospects of a future harvest. He hoped the Secretary for Scotland would take a note of this matter and look into it. In regard to the Fishery Board, he thought it came in for a great deal of unfair abuse. When an hon. Member had nothing better to do he abused the Fishery Board. He only knew one of the members of the Board personally, and that slightly, but his experience of the Board was that they took the greatest trouble and pains to keep things right. They were, however, sadly handicapped. They had only half the number of fishery cruisers which they ought to have, and their hands were tied by the limited means at their command. He hoped that in future there would be less abuse of this energetic body, and that they would get a little more sympathy from hon. Members. He trusted that something might be done to further and help the interests of the fishing industry, and improve the fishing harbours, of which there was no doubt the greatest need. The Anstruther harbour was the biggest harbour between Leith and Aberdeen, and its present condition was a disgrace, when with a little help from the Government it would be a credit to all concerned.

MR. R. L. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire) thought the fishermen in the Moray Firth suffered a peculiar hardship. At the present time the law was in their favour, but it was not exercised on their behalf for reasons of international comity. Meanwhile the livelihood of the line fishermen was being taken away from them. He joined those who had protested against the slow movement of the Scottish Office in this matter. He himself would not hesitate to refer to Norway in this connection, and he did not think the attitude of Norway in regard to this matter was calculated to improve international comity. The trawlers who emerged from Grimsby and other harbours under a false flag were not allowed to fish in Norwegian territorial waters. He would not refer to the three-miles limit because the question of a limit ought not to come into the matter. The Moray Firth was the great breeding ground for fish, and on that ground alone it ought to be closed to trawlers altogether. He regretted the absence of the Foreign Secretary on this occasion, but asked the Secretary for Scotland for an assurance that he would evolve some solution for the mitigation of this grievance which was felt very much all round the Moray Firth.

*MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) could not help expressing his regret at the absence of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs during the speech of the hon. Member for Wick Burghs, whose remarks were full of historic details and interesting information. He entirely agreed that this was a question of great international importance. If we were going to insist on the closing of the Moray Firth to the trawlers of foreign countries it would result in the altering of all the Conventions that at present existed between us and those countries, and such a thing might lead to complications. It was extraordinary under the circumstances that the Scottish Secretary should have been left to answer these questions, which were questions of urgent international importance. He had at first intended to move to report progress, but, on consideration, he thought his purpose would be served by telling the Scottish Secretary frankly that he was not qualified to answer questions of international importance. He himself had taken great interest in the question of the Moray Firth and had asked the right hon. Gentleman whether the British trawlers were to be given the same rights and privileges as were extended to foreigners. The answer he received was that the right hon. Gentleman was in favour of Englishmen keeping the law. So was he, but in this case he contended the law was wrong. As the law now stood English trawlers were debarred from trawling in waters whilst foreign trawlers were allowed to go there with impunity. The same rights ought to be extended to all. Either the Moray Firth should be closed to all or opened to all. The Government were being pressed to prevent foreign trawlers selling their fish at English ports; they had already done this in Scotland, but the only result would be that they would deprive the English people of this important food supply. And what benefit would they get? None, because the foreigners would go and sell their fish at the nearest foreign port. Trawling in the Moray Firth was objected to because it was said to be the breeding ground for fish and great damage was done to the young fish. He did not think more damage was done there than was done by trawling in deep sea. It was an area of 200 miles of the best sea fishing on the coast, and to protect a few line fishermen the Government was asked to close it to trawlers. He felt in considerable difficulty as to the way in which he should vote on this occasion, because he disagreed both with the Government and with the hon. Gentlemen who advocated closing the Moray Firth.

Mr. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs) thought the Government did not realise the very strong dissatisfaction which existed in Scotland in regard to this matter. It was especially strong because at the time of the general election a speech was made by a member of the Government which indicated that the Government were going to pursue with the utmost rigour the prevention of trawling in the Moray Firth. The only result had been to throw ridicule on the administration of the law, for, while verdicts were got in the Court of Session, those verdicts could not be executed because, it was said, their execution would interfere with international comity. He did not agree that because the foreigner could not be kept out, the Moray Firth should be thrown open to all. That would only lead to greater damage being done. The damage was not likely to be increased so long as the law remained as it was, because it was unlikely that more ships would engage in the trade than those already employed in it. He thought the Government might take measures to enforce the three-mile limit more strictly. By the removal of the coastguard, a very efficient method of protection had been abolished and the law weakened. The Government might at all events have a larger number of preventive boats. It would not cost very much money. There was a great number of small and handy boats which did not do very much, and boats which every now and then were being scrapped, and surely some of them might be put on to preventive service in the Moray Firth, round the coast of Ireland, in the Irish Channel, and various other parts where constant infractions of the three-mile limit were being committed. Whatever might be the decision of the Govern- regarding the enforcement of the law when it was in violation of international Conventions, he trusted they would prevent the infraction of the three-mile limit by the increase of the preventive service, and the prevention of the landing of illegally trawled fish in English ports. The hon. Member for Holderness had said that if the fish were not landed in English ports, they would be landed in Continental ports; well, let them be landed in Continental ports.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: Why deprive Englishmen of the benefit of them?

Mr. ANNAN BRYCE said that he presumed the fish were landed in English ports because they got a better market for them. If they were prevented from being landed in English ports, they would have to be taken to a worse market, with the result that illegal trawling would be discouraged.

Captain WARING (Banffshire) said he did not desire to say more than a few words on this subject since, after the constantly reiterated assurances of the right hon. Gentleman that this question was being dealt with, they might safely anticipate a renewal of these assurances on that occasion. One point only he desired to emphasise, and that was the enormous need for haste in this matter. The fishermen on the coast of the Moray Firth had waited patiently now for three years for a settlement of the trawling question. The right hon. Gentleman had raised their hopes repeatedly to the highest pitch by the statements he had made; for three years since the Liberal

Government came into power they had borne their disappointments with patience and resignation. They had made no attempt to attract attention to themselves or to enlist the sympathy of the Law Officers by breaking the law. But he assured the Secretary for Scotland that they would brook no further disappointment or indeed unnecessary delay. For this reason he asked the right hon. Gentleman to hurry on the negotiations that were pending. It would be impossible for the fishermen on the Banffshire coast to stand another winter such as the last, when hardly a night passed but one or other of the boats had its nets destroyed by trawling vessels, cruising round without lights and giving no heed to the damage they did; and this apart altogether from the depletion of the beds by this method of fishing, a method which necessitated often two-thirds of a catch being thrown back into the sea as useless because it consisted of immature and undersized fish which could not be landed, and every fish thrown back from a trawl was invariably dead or dying, absolutely wasted. But more important than this, owing to the continued presence of trawlers in the Moray Firth and the extraordinary delay on the part of the Government to deal effectively with the question even after repeated promises, the fishermen, or some of the younger ones, at all events, were beginning to lose heart, and were leaving the fishing villages and migrating to the larger towns. Some had gone, many others were threatening to leave. If the Government failed to bring this question to a successful issue, it would not be long before every village on the coast was deserted and a heap of ruins—villages in which at present the children were reared in a healthy rustic atmosphere. It would be a case of rural depopulation worse than any yet heard of. And this was the Government for small men, for the small holder, the Government that had introduced in three years all sorts of land legislation. Every proposal for the various parts of the country had had his support, in order to help the landward population and bring the people out of the towns and back to the land. But here they had a rural population on the land and the Government had not made the slightest attempt to keep it there. A large population in country districts was a great thing for any nation, but surely to a maritime nation such as ours the coast inhabitants were by far the most important, and by the inaction and delay on the part of the Government they were being driven away into the slums of the towns. If the Government drew back now or failed to carry out what it had promised to do in this respect it would incur a grave responsibility, for it would have wantonly and deliberately destroyed that type of rural population which he ventured to say had done much to make the Empire what it was to-day. He did not desire to quote statistics to prove the damage done by trawlers in enclosed waters and near the coast line. He had merely stated what was going on. The people were leaving. When was the Government going to take the necessary steps to keep them in their homes? They had waited long for the details of the right hon. Gentleman's scheme. He trusted they would hear it that night, and he hoped, for the sake of the reputation and political career of the all-powerful triumvirate that governed Scotland now, that their spokesman the Secretary for Scotland would satisfy that larger audience which was waiting so anxiously for his answer, the fishermen of the Scottish coast, who had such faith in the Liberal Party, whose principles they have consistently supported for the last seventy years.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said he had no doubt the question was one of particular interest to Scotland and Scottish Members; but it also largely affected the fishing population in England, Ireland, and Wales, and was an international question. There used to be an idea that the supply of fish was inexhaustible, and in the time of the old beam trawler that was to a large extent true; but the steam trawlers had done an immense amount of harm, and there was no doubt that the quantity of fish caught in the North Sea was much less than it used to be. There were 1,000,000 cwts. less fish trawled in the North Sea in 1905 than in 1903, and 2,000,000 cwts. or 30 per cent. of the fish landed on the east coast in 1905 came from foreign waters. Unless something was done to prevent the wholesale destruction of immature fish in shallow waters, the fishing industry would go from bad to worse. The hon. Member for Inverness had alluded to the necessity for more efficiently protecting the fisheries of Scotland and Ireland. He could congratulate the Scottish Members and the Scottish Fishery Board upon having been very much more successful with the Admiralty than they in Ireland had been. He was reminded that they had had a new boat built to protect the Irish fishery, but the money for building it came from Irish sources, and they got no assistance whatever from the Admiralty. The Admiralty at present lent two boats to the Fishery Board for Scotland, but none to Ireland. He therefore thought the Vice-President of the Irish Board of Agriculture and Fisheries had an unanswerable case. He drew the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover to the matter when he was Chief Secretary, and he told him that he intended to press on the Admiralty the necessity of giving them similar assistance for the protection of their fisheries. He made no apology for taking part in this Scottish debate. It was not only a local, but an international question, and he hoped the Powers who signed some of these Conventions would see their way to adopt a bigger limit of territorial water than at present existed. Most of the destruction of immature fish took place in shallow waters, and it would be for the good not only of this country but of every country that that territorial area should be extended.

*Mr. SUTHERLAND (Elgin Burghs) said he felt certain the hon. Member who had last spoken would find that in reference to the line fishermen of Ireland this question of trawling would become ever and ever more important. Might he give one or two reasons that appeared to him to be good reasons why the Foreign Office and the Scottish Office should do a great deal more than they were doing at present? When the hon. Member for the Holderness division told them that trawling did not deplete the fishing beds he spoke somewhat in ignorance. Let him take evidence which even the trawling industry would consider untainted. In 1890 the Fishery Board for Scotland received a letter, quite unsolicited, from the secretary to the National Sea Fisheries Protection Association—an association if not composed mostly of trawl owners, was largely in sympathy with trawl owners—to the effect that the Board ought to take into consideration the advisability of holding an inquiry with a view, if necessary, to closing the Moray Firth from Kinnaird Head to Duncansbay Head against trawlers. In April of the same year a Conference of representatives of the trawl fishing industry of the east coast resolved that having realised the enormous loss which the trade had sustained year by year through the wholesale capture and destruction of immature and inedible fish, a stop should be put to the growing evil, and as a preliminary step in this direction, it was agreed to abstain during the coming summer from fishing on the grounds where immature fish were generally caught in great abundance. The area alluded to exceeded 5,200 miles. Then again, in 1905, the association met in Aberdeen, when a motion to consider the advisability of re-stocking fishing grounds which might be wholly or partially exhausted, was carried unanimously. The mover of the resolution said—

> "Unless they did something as a counterpoise to the continual trawling which was going on they would find themselves powerless as regarded that important fishing ground, the North Sea. He did not believe the North Sea, if left to itself, would last for ever. He was one of those who thought it would not last very long."

As he had stated, he quoted that evidence from an association biassed in favour of trawling. Then they had the opinion of the English Board of Fisheries and Agriculture. Certainly no one who knew the facts would deny that there was an antagonism of policy between that Board and the Fishery Board for Scotland. Neither would anyone assert that the Board of Agriculture was hostile to trawling. The latest Report which he had been able to see was that for 1905. It was only since 1903 that statistics were given distinguishing between fish caught in the North Sea and elsewhere. The main features brought out by the figures of the Board of Agriculture were the growing importance of waters beyond the North Sea for maintaining the fish supply of the country, and the fact that it was from the North Sea alone that a decreased supply was shown. What was true of the North Sea told even more strongly, in his opinion, in regard to the Moray Firth. That Firth was a comparatively small area, in which immature fish existed in great abundance. Within its limits there were important spawning grounds where vast shoals of the food fishes congregated at the breeding season. It contained Smith's Bank, the most valuable and prolific spawning ground near the east coast, and which was a source of supply to waters outside the Firth. They had the high authority of Mr. W. Garstang for saying that from 1889 to 1898 the fish caught by a trawl-smack was reduced from sixty to thirty-two tons. If they compared the fish caught by trawlers in the North Sea in 1903 and 1905 they found a reduction of 25 per cent. Or put in another way, 1,000 tons—some said 1,400 tons—less were caught weekly in the latter year than in the former. If they took the waters outside the North Sea where trawling had not been continuously conducted, it was remarkable that there was an increase of over 500 tons a week. All that went to show that trawling depleted the fisheries. The present trawling fleet was equal to over 12,000 of the old fishing smacks. In an interesting article which appeared in the "Scotsman" some time ago, the writer said that it was calculated that the spread of nets or the width of sea bottom covered extended at least to twenty-five miles, and that with a net towed at a speed of three miles per hour for twenty working hours per day, the area daily swept by them amounted to 1,500 square miles. The whole of the Moray Firth would thus be swept from shore to shore in a day and a half. The same fleet could trawl the North Sea from the Straits of Dover to the Shetlands several times a year. In view of the facts which he had stated he put it to the Committee, whether it was not wise on the part of the Scottish Fishery Board to prohibit trawling in the Moray Firth. The hon. Member for the Holderness division had said, that they in England would obey the law even if it were only a by-law of the Fishery Board. The sanction given to the Board for framing the by-laws was in an Act of Parliament, and therefore these by-laws had the authority of that House. He might repeat what he had stated on a former occasion, that the Sea Fisheries Association had met in Aberdeen in 1905, and that the hon. Member for Grimsby had practically justified Grimsby trawl owners in not merely evading, but in flouting the law of Scotland. The hon. Member had admitted that Grimsby trawl boats sailed under a foreign flag, although the shares were held by Englishmen.

MR. STANLEY WILSON said that the hon. Gentleman denied it.

MR. SUTHERLAND said that he based his statement on the official report of the association. There was no evidence, according to his information, that when English trawl vessels were transferred to the Norwegian flag, any money passed between the parties, or that share quotations appeared in the Norwegian newspapers. As bearing out what he had said, he might mention that in 1905 a gentleman who had resided at Grimsby went to Stavanger, and was now a registered owner of five trawl boats. A clerk who was employed by a Leith firm, and who he was informed received only from 15s. to 20s. a week, had, within a short time of his having gone to Norway, become the registered owner of several boats.

MR. STANLEY WILSON asked whether the hon. Member thought we could congratulate ourselves on having by our policy driven these men out of England.

MR. SUTHERLAND said he could not congratulate anyone who tried to evade the law in the way he had described. Hon. Members opposite were never tired of taunting Irishmen with framing conspiracies to violate the law of the land. The attempt on the part of Grimsby trawl owners to defeat the law was a cold-blooded, merciless, squalid conspiracy, a conspiracy intended not for purposes of patriotism, but in order to secure bigger dividends.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs) said it was unjust that the whole of the Opposition should be branded as having taunted Ireland in the way suggested. He had never taunted Ireland with anything.

Mr. SUTHERLAND said the Committee would bear him out in saying that the Opposition as a whole denounced Irishmen for entering into conspiracies to defeat the law. What were they to do? The question was very urgent; feeling was acute along the shores of Moray Firth. In the case of Olsen, which was referred to by the hon. Member for the Wick Burghs, whom he congratulated on his speech, Lord Kyllachy expressed the view that the Act of 1889 applied to foreigners as well as British subjects in respect to waters specified in Bye-law No. 2, and that such waters must be regarded as territorial in the light of Article 2 of the North Sea Convention. The High Court of Justiciary was unanimously of opinion that the bye-laws could be enforced against all foreigners, and in the whole area inside a line drawn from Duncansby Head to Rattray Point. As hon. Members were aware, proceedings had practically been stopped not only against the foreign trawlers but also against the Grimsby trawlers. In October, 1906, the Secretary for Scotland said, in answer to the hon. Member for Ross, that the whole question of prosecuting offending trawlers was under the consideration of the Government. They were thus confronted with the fact that the Government, which included the Foreign Secretary, and must have considered all possible complications, took three weeks to consider whether foreign trawlers were to be prosecuted, and shortly after deciding to prosecute, and after obtaining convictions, proceedings against foreign trawlers were stopped, and the attitude of the Government was not easy to understand. It appeared to him that there should not be so much difficulty in getting the Moray Firth clear of all trawlers. A year or two ago the Norwegian representative informed the Fishery Board of Scotland that if the North Sea Powers were called together to consider the question of closing the Firth, Norway would give the matter the most favourable and sympathetic consideration. What was the position in regard to foreign countries on this question? Since the year 1872 beam trawling had not been allowed in Denmark. In France, Belgium, and Germany trawling was practically prohibited in territorial waters, and in Norway trawling was not allowed within a geographical mile from the furthest outlying island, which was fifty miles distant. When those considerations were taken into account the way seemed cleared for coming to an agreement with Norway. The Secretary for Scotland told the House, in answer to a Question, that it was the intention of the Government to prohibit the landing of trawl-caught fish in England as well as in Scotland, and Lord Fitzmaurice made a similar statement in the House of Lords. Nothing had been done in that direction. He remembered having a talk with their Ambassador to America who was for long one of the distinguished Members for Aberdeen. Mr. Bryce said in reference to this trawling question that practically the same speeches were made year after year. He did not know whether that was so or not, but he knew that, year after year, the same complaints were made, the same answer was given on behalf of the Government, and they seemed to get no "forrarder." He knew that when the Member for Grimsby made the statement to which he had alluded, the representative of the English Board of Agriculture and Fisheries was on the platform and uttered not a syllable of protest. He must say that Scottish Members were surfeited with the promises of the Secretary for Scotland. It was nonsense for the hon. Gentleman opposite to say that the fishermen of the Moray Firth were behind the times. No class of men were more up-to-date in their methods. In the old days the brown sails of their boats studded every sea along the coast. Those men were as brave and industrious a body of men as could be found anywhere. The question of what action was to be taken was a very urgent one. Feeling along the shores of the Moray Firth had grown intensely acute. Many of the fishermen there had only been prevented from taking the law into their own hands by the persuasion of others. The Fishery Board for Scotland had done its best, but had received very little backing. It was for the Secretary for Scotland to tell the House what stage the negotiations had reached. It was no good his saying month after month "everything is going right," if nothing was being done. From the month of March until now communications had been going on between the Board of Agriculture of England and the Scottish Office. Surely it was an easy thing in five months to come to an agreement which would enable the Foreign Office to open negotiations with the North Sea Powers. Was one Department being played off against another, and were their communications to each other to be continued for other five months with as little fruit? He asked the right hon. Gentleman to say what prospect there was of this question being speedily settled. He appealed to the Foreign Secretary and to the Secretary for Scotland not to ignore the claims of those men who took their lives in their hands to earn a scanty livelihood, but to recognise the prime and pressing importance of the two questions, and to deal with it effectively.

CAPTAIN ARTHUR MURRAY (Kincardineshire) said he was glad to see the Secretary for Foreign Affairs on the Treasury Bench, because it would appear that the Secretary for Scotland had shifted the whole responsibility for the trawling question to the shoulders of the right hon. Gentleman. Various representations had been made in regard to the inaction of the Government during the last two or three years with regard to this particular question, but he would like to go back a little further. In 1892 when the question was first raised it was proposed to exclude trawlers from the Moray Firth, and various objections were brought forward by the trawlers' association, the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce, and by meetings of the citizens of Aberdeen. The chief objection was that if bye-law No 10 was passed and confirmed it would not be possible to exclude foreign trawlers to whatever extent it might exclude British trawlers from the Moray Firth. Before bye-law No 10 was confirmed by the Secretary of Scotland, he understood that it was submitted to the Foreign Office, and the Foreign Office replied that they had no objection to the confirmation of the bye-law provided that so far as extra territorial waters were concerned it only applied to British subjects. That was to say, in the year 1892, the Foreign Office accepted that situation, and they recognised the fact that under this bye-law it would be impossible to exclude foreign trawlers from carrying on operations in the Moray Firth. He would, therefore, like to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what the Foreign Office had done during all those years, knowing at that time that this was a question which had come prominently forward and that it would eventually become a question which would cause serious injury to all the populations along the shores of the Moray Firth. He appealed to the Foreign Secretary, on whom the responsibility rested, gravely to consider the situation. It could be settled. If there was a will there was a way. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to revolve the wheels of inter-State communications a little more rapidly in order to bring to an end a situation which was irritating to British trawlers and line fishermen alike.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) hoped the Scottish Members would insist on Scotland being governed in accordance with the opinion of the majority of the Scottish Members of the House. There were two questions now before the Committee. One was the question of trawling in the Moray Firth, and the other the question of illegal trawling at other parts of the Scottish coast. They were told a few days ago by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs that nothing had been settled up to the present and that the Foreign Secretary was waiting to hear from some of the other departments of the Government in this country. The right hon. Gentleman did not say what the other departments were, but he presumed the Scottish Office was one. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would tell the Committee to-night who was the person who had been delaying the matter by keeping particulars from him and preventing him from completing the negotiations with Foreign Governments. Their complaint was not against foreign trawlers but against English trawlers whose ships were registered under foreign flags. He could understand the Norwegian Government taking a serious interest in this matter if Norwegian subjects were making money out of it, but nothing of the sort was happening. The trawling in the Moray Firth was carried on by Grimsby and Hull fishing companies, whose boats were registered in Norway in order that they might be able to break British law. He was bound to say that he did not think the Norwegian Government were doing what was right. He did not think they should allow their flag to be used for breaking the law in this country. He trusted the Foreign Secretary would point out to that Government the state of things which might arise if all Governments were to take the same course of allowing their flags to be used for the purpose of breaking the law.

MR. STANLEY WILSON asked whether the hon. Member was aware that the trawlers referred to as registered in Norway were owned by companies who found the money there.

*MR. MORTON said that so far as he had been able to get at the facts they were English ships in everything except the cook and the registration. If the hon. Member could prove to him that the vessels belonged to Norwegians whose money was involved in the industry he might have another opinion of the matter. The Scottish Judges had given an opinion in 1906 as to the legality of trawling by foreign ships in the Moray Firth, and yet the Secretary for Scotland had done nothing in the matter. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to be rather in favour of the trawlers because there was so much money invested in the industry. He stated in a speech some time ago at Wick that he wanted to protect the trawlers and that he wanted fair play. All that he and his friends were asking for was fair play for their own country. Of course they could not ask fairly for more, but so far as he could understand from the Foreign Secretary's answer nothing had been done up to the present moment. The Secretary for Scotland ought to take upon himself the settlement of the preliminaries which would enable the Foreign Secretary to take some action. He wished to say say a word about the illegal trawling round the coast of Sutherlandshire. There again he wanted fair play, and above all he wanted the law to be enforced. The people of Scotland were law-abiding, but the Secretary for Scotland was not; at least, he did not make others obey the law. He allowed the rich to go free. The policy pursued by the Secretary for Scotland would, if persisted in, drive from the country some 60,000 hardy fishermen, a class most useful in supplying recruits to the Navy. They had been told about the three mile limit, but there was some doubt as to whether it was a legal limit at all. What they asked was that the three mile limit, such as it was, should be respected, and trawlers, British or foreign, should be kept out of these waters. He had written many letters to the Secretary for Scotland and he had asked him Questions on this subject, but he had been unable to get any redress whatever for the grievance which was felt so strongly. They were told that in some cases the law was not strong enough. If that was so, why did not the right hon. Gentleman get the law strengthened? The right hon. Gentleman did not come to the House asking for further powers, but on the contrary he opposed every attempt made by private Members to get increased powers. The right hon. Gentleman blocked their Bills every night when they brought them up. His complaint was that the Secretary for Scotland not only would not look after this matter himself, but that he would not allow others to do so. [Laughter.] He was sorry that anybody should regard this as a laughing matter. It was an exceedingly serious matter. The policy of the Government was to drive the fishermen out of the country, though no better men could be got for the naval reserve. No effort had been made to secure the services of fast boats to catch the trawlers which were engaged in the illegal proceedings complained of. Let the right hon. Gentleman get the use of some of those fast torpedo-destroyers, which would be much better employed in detecting and capturing illegal trawlers than in running down each other. A case of illegal trawling was tried at Campeltown on 4th September, 1907, and the Sheriff, before pronouncing sentence against the offender, made the following pregnant remarks—

> " From a tolerable experience of convictions of those who have been guilty of transgressing the law as to otter trawling, I venture to think that until Parliament sees fit to permit the imposition of much more drastic punishment than the limit which at present the Courts have

power to inflict, and the provision of more adequate means for the detection and capture of offenders, such as more and faster cruisers, little can be done effectively to prevent illegal trawling, and what at present, it must be confessed, appears likely to be the ultimate consequence—the ruin of the entire fishing industry. It is becoming notorious, amounting almost to a scandal, that the punishment which at present it is in the power of the Courts to inflict is wholly inadequate to prevent the infraction of the law, and that the number and the speed of the protective vessels at the disposal of the Fishery Board is wholly incommensurate with the necessities of the case."

It might be said that hon. Members who represented constituencies in the North of Scotland where fishing was an important industry were politically interested, but the words he had quoted expressed the opinion of an independent Scottish Judge. He urged the Secretary for Scotland to see that the fisheries and the line fishermen were properly protected, and that the law was obeyed by everybody, rich and poor alike.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick) said he was sorry he was unable to be present to hear the speeches in the earlier stage of the debate, for he realised from what he had heard since that a good deal of attention had been directed to the position of the Foreign Office in relation to this matter, and that desire and expectations were shown for some statement from himself from the point of view of the Foreign Office. He would be sorry to disappoint the expectation, but he had no confidence that he would be able to gratify it. He could not, of course, speak in his personal capacity as Member for his own constituency, or else he might have a good deal to say on the general question of trawling in the Moray Firth; and when he spoke in his official capacity as representing the Foreign Office he might say that the Foreign Office was not very intimately concerned in the matter at all. Though he could speak on one point in which the Foreign Office was concerned, he must speak as a Member of the Government rather than as the head of a particular Department. The hon. Member for Elgin Burghs in a very forcible and eloquent speech had dwelt very strongly on the merits of the question with regard to the Moray Firth, his point being that in the interests of the preservation of the fish supply and breeding grounds it was essential that trawling should be prohibited in the Moray Firth. He had no desire to dispute any statement the hon. Member had made on the merits of the question. He had not the knowledge even if he had the desire. When he first became cognisant of the trawling question at all, trawling was allowed within the three-mile limit, and the demand was put forward, many years ago, that trawling should be prohibited within territorial waters. He came into Parliament pledged to that, and that had been imposed long ago. But the contention now was that the three-mile limit was not enough, and, especially in regard to the Moray Firth, that there ought to be special regulations going far beyond the three-mile limit. Parliament had recognised that with regard to the legislation it had passed. There was no doubt that the legislation passed was good law for all British subjects, and he would have no sympathy whatever with those who, being British subjects and knowing perfectly well what the opinion of Parliament was as regards the law for British subjects, took advantage and made use of a foreign flag in in order to evade the regulations of the Moray Firth, which it was obviously the desire of Parliament should be enforced. But when they came to the question of enforcing the law Parliament had passed upon foreign owners, they were placed in a very difficult position. The policy of this country hitherto—the national policy of this country—had been to uphold the three-mile limit, but to protest against and to resist by every means in our power the pretension of any foreign country to enforce its own jurisdiction on the sea beyond the three-mile limit. He was sure there must be more than one case in which we had gone to international arbitration and had attempted to contend before an international tribunal that the three-mile limit was the only one we could recognise as the limit of foreign jurisdiction over British vessels. What would happen if we applied in the Moray Firth to foreigners the law which we had made for our own fishermen who went beyond the three-mile limit?

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) asked if there were not considerable qualifications of the three-mile limit in the case of bays.

SIR EDWARD GREY said it had generally been understood that such qualifications applied to bays ten miles wide, but the Moray Firth was far more than ten miles wide.

AN HON. MEMBER said it was applied in the case of the Bristol Channel, which was thirty-seven miles wide.

SIR EDWARD GREY said they must be very careful as to how far they pressed this doctrine of the width of the bay. The qualified application of the doctrine he thought applied to bays with a very narrow entrance. But they must be very careful before they laid down an international doctrine on any particular bay. They must think of what the application of it might be in other parts of the world. The important point was that they had generally contended for the three-mile limit as that beyond which they resented the jurisdiction of foreign Powers over British ships; and having taken that point of view in such cases as the Behring Sea arbitration case quite recently, suppose they themselves were to attempt to enforce a doctrine going far beyond the three-mile limit on foreign ships—and he supposed the House was as strongly attached to the principle of arbitration as to any other principle, and would not resist a demand for arbitration if it were disputed by a foreign Power— how would it be possible to contend with a good chance of success before an international tribunal in an arbitration case for a doctrine precisely the reverse of that for which they had used their strength on previous occasions? He would be the last person in the world to wish to underrate the capacity, the ability, or the energy of the Foreign Office; but it would be absolutely impossible for the Foreign Office one year to give instructions for the conduct of an arbitration case on the rule of international law with the three-mile limit as the extreme limit of the jurisdiction of any nation, and in the following year to fight an arbitration case on a precisely opposite doctrine. It was obvious that that would bring us into ridicule in the world at large. Our international doctrine hitherto had been that of the three-mile limit; it followed from that, that if there was to be a modification of the rules relating to trawling in the North Sea, it must be by agreement with foreign Powers. That clearly seemed to him the practical point on which the debate might turn. It had been rather assumed in the debate that the Foreign Office as such had some particular policy in the matter. The Foreign Office had no policy whatever in regard to the fishing industry. It had not the knowledge or the means for framing a policy. The business of the Foreign Office was to approach every case on whatever lines the Government of the day had decided to be those of the national interest. Once it was decided that it was to the national interest that we should get a certain agreement with foreign Powers, the Foreign Office would use every means in its power to induce other nations to take the same view and to enter into an agreement with us. It was absolutely impossible on an important question affecting not merely Scottish and not merely English and not merely Irish interests, but the interests of all the three countries combined—for they were all interested in the fishing industry, taking it as a whole—for the Foreign Office to approach other Powers with a view to reaching an agreement with them until it was quite clear that it was doing it in the interest of the policy which had been adopted and affirmed and declared by the Government of the day to be the policy which was in the general national interest of the United Kingdom. For that same reason he thought it was going too far when some one in the course of the debate spoke as if his right hon. friend the Secretary for Scotland was open to reproach in the matter. It was not possible for him alone to declare what the national policy of the country was to be in the fishing industry. He would be perfectly prepared that they should approach foreign Powers, and it had always seemed to him, judging from the very great force with which the case had been presented in such regions as the Moray Firth, and the strong feeling that existed, which was not confined to the Moray Firth alone, that there was a case for grave consideration on the part of any Government as to whether any change and any new regulations were required in the interests of the preservation of the fishing industry in the North Sea at large. The Government could not sacrifice a legitimate industry unless they were going to do so in the national interest, and nobody disputed that trawling in itself was a perfectly legitimate industry. It was also a considerable industry, with large capital invested in it. Therefore, if the industry was to be restricted the restrictions must be upon the same grounds of really important national interests, which transcended what would otherwise be the legitimate interests of that particular industry. They had no right either for the sake of particular interests or particular places to sacrifice the general interests of the consumers of the country. They had no right, for instance, to adopt in the interests of particular localities any special restrictions upon the methods of catching fish with the result of diminishing the supply and raising the price of one of the most wholesome articles of food in a great industrial country. But having laid down those two principles, it was equally true that, if, on the other hand, it was the case that the supply of fish in the North Sea was being affected by want of further regulations, they were entitled to say that the interests of any particular industry must be subordinated to the general interests of the supply of fish in the North Sea, for, after all, in the long run, it was not merely the national interest, but the interest of the industry concerned. If it was the case that in areas like the Moray Firth, which were important breeding grounds, the supply of fish was being seriously interfered with by the prosecution of trawling in narrow waters, then it became a matter of national interest that they should as soon as possible come to some agreement with foreign Powers under which they would be able to make the arrangements which proved to be necessary in the national interest at large. He could only say that the subject was one which had been occupying the attention of the Government. In view of the arguments which had been brought forward and the strength of feeling which was known to exist on this important subject, it was quite clear that the Government must have time to come to a deliberate decision, and to investigate the case which had been presented, with the object of considering whether it should not approach other Powers in order to come to some arrangement which would enable breeding areas such as the Moray Firth to be secured from molestation by any methods of fishing which were likely to be injurious. He could only say that the subject had occupied the attention of the Government for a considerable time. The Government had, unfortunately, many things to occupy its attention. He was alive, as the Secretary for Scotland had been extremely alive, to the importance of the question, and though he was not in a position to tell the Committee what the decision of the Government might be when the investigation which was now proceeding by the departments concerned had been concluded, he thought those Members who represented the constituencies keenly interested in the question had a right to expect that the decision of the Government should not be indefinitely delayed, but that they should know in a reasonable time whether the Government thought they had a case for approaching other Powers, and if they thought so what were the grounds and what were the propositions which they should advance.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) hoped that the result of the debate would be to hasten the action of the Government, and that some active step would soon be taken to reach some agreement on this important point. But those who represented Scotland had a right to ask why the importance of the question had not been realised at an earlier period. As the matter stood, ridicule had been incurred both abroad and at home, and especially in the North of Scotland. They had also to complain of the kind of answers they had received from the Scottish Office on the matter, which were just the same as had been given to similar questions on the matter for many years. They recognised the difficulties of the situation and did not wish to press the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs unduly, and could only hope that a solution would soon be arrived at. They hoped that the strong protests made would bring home to the Government, if the Scottish Office had not succeeded in doing so, the importance of the question. He could not refrain from taking exception to the action of the hon. Members for Sutherland and Ross in introducing repressive legislation against trawlers. He alluded to the Sea Fisheries Regulation Bill (No. 2), and to the Suspension of Trawler Masters' Certificates Bill. They were Bills he had blocked and intended to block in common with the Government. The repressive legislation only had the effect of frightening capital and harming a useful industry, and it was not the way to procure the strict keeping of the law. The action of those two Members was in marked contrast with that of other Members. He, as strongly as anyone, repudiated the action of the so-called British trawlers steaming under a foreign flag in order to evade the law, and he joined in the condemnation of British subjects who were guilty of such proceedings. He thought the debate might possibly do some good in bringing about a speedy conclusion, and if it did they might congratulate themselves upon having obtained three hours and made good use of them.

*Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said he was sorry the hon. Member had struck a discordant note by attacking the hon. Members for Ross and Sutherland. If he lived amongst or represented the people in those small bays, he would know that by the visit of these trawlers whole communities were ruined and devastated in the course of one night; and he would not have attacked his hon. friends as he had done. If they took the fishing away from these people, they left them practically nothing. The speech of the hon. Member was to be regretted. They did not find in his district that the owners of trawlers had much respect for the law. Their doctrine was "Catch fish, never mind how; never mind if you break the law or devastate a village, bring home fish; it does not matter if you go to gaol." And the poor captains had to go to gaol. They did not want to send the captain and the men to gaol; they wanted to send the owners there. He had told the hon. Member for Grimsby on the occasion of the great trawlers meeting at Aberdeen that it was the owners of the trawlers who should be sent to gaol. It was a serious and burning question in the extreme North. They regretted very much that the Fishery Board for Scotland had not been able to do everything that they wished it to do, and had not protected their fishing industry as well as it might have done; but the Fishery Board had not received much help from the people in the districts. They had formed associations from one end to the other, and they had encouraged the fishermen to try and catch the trawlers. This had done a considerable amount of good, and he guaranteed that owing to the liberality of his hon. friend opposite and important persons who had subscribed considerably to their funds, they had secured more convictions in Orkney and Shetland than in the whole of the rest of Scotland. He thought they might all do more in this way to support and encourage the Fishery Board. It would be absolutely impossible, even if the Secretary for Scotland had two or three more cruisers, to protect every little bay or creek in the territorial waters of Scotland. The area was enormous, and it would take more vessels and more men than he was ever likely to have at his disposal. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Member for the Holderness Division of Yorkshire as to the food supply of the people being in peril, he thought, if any Party in the House had any right to speak on that subject, it was the Party on that side of the House, and not the Party on the other side of the House, who had tried to attack the food of the people. The trawlers brought in a large quantity of immature fish and even destroyed them. They could not sell them in Scottish or continental waters; it was only in England where they were allowed to dispose of them. They complained of that more than anything else. Fish which was caught illegally was sold in English waters and could not be sold anywhere else, and it was here where they thought the Government might take very important action. He admitted the difficulties under which the Foreign Secretary laboured. Even supposing he was successful in his negotiations with the foreign Powers, it would still be open to persons who had no respect for the law to have Grimsby or Hull boats registered in some unknown land and to defy the British laws. He thought the

Foreign Secretary might try and induce foreign Powers to be no longer a party to the absolute scandal of allowing their flag to be prostituted to enable British trawl owners to break British laws. If a person employing capital in such trades as gun running or slave owning, or drink selling, where such actions were prohibited, was liable to confiscation, it would be quite within the province of the Government to declare that where British capital was employed illegally under a foreign name there should be some means by which the capital should be impounded and confiscated. He saw no other way out of the difficulty. If that was done and the fish were prevented from being sold in British waters it would be a great stride towards protecting their industries. From all one could learn, trawling had increased so enormously that the fish supply in the Northern part of the country was rapidly being depleted, and where the supply in the future would come from was very hard to realise. He was not making any attack on the Secretary for Scotland. The same policy had been pursued for fifteen or twenty years in Scotland; but they might do a great deal more than they did to encourage fishermen to protect themselves and might do more than they did to try and make some alteration by which those persons who illegally and wrongfully sent poor people out to do wrong should be punished instead of their poor instruments.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said this question of trawling had been for a long time before Parliament and it was not now in a very satisfactory condition. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had given the Committee as usual the common sense of the matter in regard to British relations with foreigners. Probably there would have to be some regulation of the North Sea fisheries. A great deal of investigation was still being carried on into that matter, and he doubted whether the moment for international agreement had arrived, but the sooner an understanding was reached the better it would be for the fisheries of all the countries concerned in the North Sea. The Foreign Secretary had admitted that in this island at any rate, the policy of Parliament ought to be supreme. The Moray Firth had been closed upon the ground that the fisheries there were being depleted and it would add to the fish supply if it were closed. An important part of the restriction upon fishing in the Moray Firth was that fish caught there could not be landed at any Scottish port; but what to him was the weak point in the policy they had pursued of late years, was that they could be landed at any English port. They could not be landed at a port in Berwickshire, but they could be landed at an inlet in the constituency of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. There might be admirable reasons for it, but they were not arguments that had ever appealed to his understanding and he was as yet unconvinced that the English ports ought to be free to the fish caught within a prohibited area. If they had no sympathy with the British owned trawlers who broke the law in the Moray Firth, he did not think their sympathy need be extended to the owners of the catches, and he held the strong view that if this policy of restricting the catch in the Moray Firth was to be persevered with the prohibition should be extended to all British ports, and if it could not be so extended it would be better to open the Moray Firth altogether. He thought on the whole the restricting policy was right, but they had never yet had any satisfactory explanation from any Government as to the reasons for prohibiting the catch from the Moray Firth being landed in Scotland and allowing it to be landed at English ports.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) said he was somewhat disappointed with the statement made by the Foreign Secretary. He had heard similar speeches made by Foreign Secretaries for many years. He hoped he would see that something was done. The right hon. Gentleman said he was prepared to approach the foreign Powers. Had he done nothing at present? He had believed matters were progressing. He could only hope they would be pushed forward. Surely to keep the line fishermen along our coast, one of the finest assets we had, was a matter of national importance. In the event of a great naval war, where would the country be without the line fishermen? It had been one of the most refreshing nights he had ever had in the House of Commons. There was dissatisfaction in the air and it had been expressed by hon. Members who had recently come into the House. He had refrained specially from getting up and making observations until they had had their say, and he was very glad they had spoken their minds. It was a good, healthy sign, and there was some chance of Scotland waking up to the fact that she had been very badly treated indeed for many long years. The promises which had been given by the Liberal leaders that the grievances of the line fishermen would be attended to, were no doubt the means of catching a great many votes. Of course, he did not blame the leaders of either Party for making speeches which would catch votes, but if pledges were given, they were entitled to have them redeemed. Upon this subject the Government had entirely failed to fulfil their pledges. All round the coast this illegal trawling was going on and nothing was done to stop it. The grievances of the line fishermen remained unredressed, while the number of steam trawlers in Scottish waters had increased enormously. The fishery cruisers, however, remained at the old number, and he urged that more were wanted to catch the sea thieves and foreign pirates in the Moray Firth. The Secretary for Scotland and his colleagues in the Government were doing their best to drive the people into the slums of our cities. The fishing industry was being ruined, and he blamed the Secretary for Scotland for the indifference he had shown in the matter. Hon. Members representing Scotland had continually put questions to the Secretary for Scotland, but they always received the same answer. They wanted more cruisers, and if they could not get them from the Secretary for Scotland they ought to apply to the Board of Admiralty. He could not understand why so much consideration was given to Norway in regard to this subject. Some prompt action ought to be taken to stop the illegal trawling. These Norwegian ships owned by British shareholders were paying enormous dividends and ruining Scottish fishermen, who were being continually told that their case was being attended to. He had with him statistics appertaining to this subject, and he could talk easily for a couple of hours. [Cries of "Go on."] The line fishing industry was getting worse every day. He hoped the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would be able to make some satisfactory arrangement with foreign Powers to put an end to this grievance.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said that as that was the only opportunity they would have this session of reviewing the position of Scottish fishermen he was glad to have that chance of saying a word in regard to the whole subject. One would gather from the closing remarks of the hon. Gentleman that the Scottish fisheries were in a depressed and decaying and ruinous condition. The fact was entirely the other way. There never was such a record year for the Scottish fisheries.

MR. WEIR said that that was due to the trawlers.

MR. SINCLAIR said that if his hon. friend would allow him to proceed with the statement he was about to make, he would show that he had not been indifferent to the interests of the fishermen. In years past he had shown and the Government had shown entire sympathy with the position of the line fishermen. With regard to the Moray Firth itself, there had been an increase in twelve months in the capital invested in Scottish fishing boats—not steam trawlers, but steam drifters and liners—of £600,000, and of that no less than £400,000 was attributable to the industry and enterprise of the Moray Firth fishermen. He really thought that deserved to be put on record. He agreed with much that had been said in regard to the desirability of securing adequate closure of the Moray Firth to trawlers, but it should not go forth from the House that the industry was otherwise than in a very prosperous condition. The hon. Gentleman had attributed to him the responsibility for the decay of the Scottish fisheries. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would look into the statistics and figures of which he had given only one example. The figures, at any rate, absolved him from the charge of having no sympathy for, or interest in, this most important industry.

He would make one other observation. There was undoubtedly a disquieting symptom when they looked at the fishery statistics. It was undoubtedly the case that the fishermen had to go further for their fish, and that there were some symptoms which led good judges of the subject, like the hon. Member for the Elgin Burghs and others who had spoken that night, to fear that there was a depletion of the North Sea, which was the main source of our fish supplies. That was the justification for the money spent by this country in scientific investigation and for the work of the International Commission for the research of the North Sea, to which this country was a party. This very depletion of the sources of supply was originally one of the reasons for the passing of Acts of Parliament which gave power to the Fishery Board to pass bye-laws for the closure of the Moray Firth, which bye-laws were subsequently passed. That being the case the House would readily perceive that the Government in their policy of endeavouring to secure agreement between the various Powers in the North Sea for the closure of this important area was in line with all that this Government and previous Governments had done in the matter. One word in defence of his own action. In March this year he announced the decision of the Government to endeavour to arrive at the point when they could approach foreign Powers. No time had been lost. Such an invitation to foreign Powers must be founded upon a scheme of scientific investigation, and such a scheme must take some time to prepare. The proposals must go from all departments of the Government. No time would be lost. Scottish Members might rest assured that the Scottish case had been presented and strongly urged, and would be strongly urged in the future. One or two questions of high policy had interested the House very much that evening, and, after discussing them, it was difficult to come down to the humdrum routine of fishery administration. He would only make one observation in reply to the hon. Member for the Inverness Burghs, who had complained of the supineness of the Government in regard to enforcement of the regulations. It was the policy of the Government to enforce the regulations, and if the hon. Member would look at the record of convictions, he would find that the regulations had been faithfully and vigorously carried out by the Fishery Board. He must adhere to what he said on another occasion, that the Scottish Office and the Fishery Board, if they were to represent the fishing interests of Scotland as a whole, must not be assumed to be concerned solely with one class of fisheries. It was their duty to see that the interests of all were protected by such means as they had in their power, and it was only in that way that they could do their duty to the fisheries of Scotland as a whole. He trusted that the assurances which had been given by his right hon. friend and himself would tend to allay the charges of want of energy and activity on the part of the Scottish Office in this matter.

And, it being Eleven of the Clock, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolutions to be reported to-morrow; Committee also report progress; to sit again to-morrow.

UNEMPLOYED AT GLASGOW.

On the Motion for the adjournment of the House—

*MR. BARNES reminded the House that on two separate occasions the Prime Minister had held out the hope that part of the time that night would be available for the discussion of the question of the unemployed at Glasgow. That was a matter of considerable importance to the people of Scotland, and to the people of Glasgow especially. He thought he and his friends who represented that city had fair ground to complain that a portion of the time which had been given to the discussion of fisheries had not been given to the discussion of the question of the unemployed. The Secretary for Scotland did not get up to reply until twelve minutes to eleven, and he spoke up to eleven o'clock. He did not know what other opportunity would be given for the discussion of the question of the unemployed, but there were ways and means by which a reasonable amount of time might be found for the discussion of the subject. He suggested that the opportunity might be found on the Report stage of some Scottish Vote. He hoped the Patronage Secretary would put the matter before the Prime Minister, and that he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the request made by him in this matter had not been complied with.

Mr. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton) supported the appeal made by his hon. friend. Glasgow was face to face at the present moment with an acute problem. As time had not been found for the discussion of the subject that night, he hoped the Government would afford another opportunity for its being brought before the House. It was a question which affected over 1,000,000 people in Scotland at present.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College) said the promise given by the Prime Minister that there would be an opportunity for the discussion of the unemployed question that night had not been fulfilled on account of the action of the Secretary for Scotland in delaying so long his reply on the fisheries question. He hoped another opportunity for discussion would be found.

Mr. C. E. PRICE, while admitting the importance of the discussion which had taken place on the fisheries question, regretted that the Foreign Secretary and the Secretary for Scotland did not speak earlier, in order that time might have been available for the discussion of the question of the unemployed. He thought it was a very great pity that when the Scottish Estimates came before the House the debates should be confined to one or two questions, although there were others on which hon. Members desired to speak. He hoped that the Government next year would make arrangements to give two days for the discussion.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. J. A. Pease, Essex, Saffron Walden) said he would be very glad to convey to the Prime Minister the representations which had been made to him. At the same time, perhaps he might be allowed to say that there was some difficulty in getting even the half-day which the Scottish Members wished at this stage of the session. The Government recognised the importance of the question which hon. Members desired to raise, and although the Prime Minister did not pledge himself that there would be an opportunity to discuss the question, they were anxious that an opportunity might be afforded for, at any rate, a short debate.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said that if what had happened that night was the Government's idea of giving an opportunity for debate it appeared to him that they had acted with singular maladroitness. He hoped that the Government would respond to the appeal which had been made for another opportunity to discuss the question. This was only another instance of the way in which the business of the House was conducted, or rather mismanaged by the Government.

Adjourned at eleven minutes after Eleven o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CXCI.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Appellate Jurisdiction [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Read 2ª 30th June (497) Committee 6th July (1204)
Assizes & Quarter Sessions [H.L.]	*Lord Alverstone*	Report 1st July (737) Read 3ª and passed 2nd July (930)
*Commons [H.L.]	*Earl Carrington*	Read 2ª 2nd July (928)
Coroners (Ireland)	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 1ª 8th July (1595)
Criminal Appeal (Amendment) [H.L.]	*Lord Alverstone*	Read 2ª 25th June (18) Committee } 29th June (320) Report } Read 3ª and passed 30th June (496)
*Endowed Schools (Masters) [H.L.]	*Earl Beauchamp*	Read 1ª 1st July (731) Read 2ª 7th July (1419)
*Evicted Tenants (Ireland) [H.L.]	*Earl of Crewe*	Read 2ª 25th June (4) Committee 8th July (1595)
Incest		Read 1ª 6th July (1149)
Land Values (Scotland)	*Lord Herschell*	Report 2nd July (902)
Law of Distress (Amendment)	*Lord Courtney of Penwith*	Read 1ª 6th July (1149)
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press)	*Earl of Donoughmore*	Read 1ª 29th June (295)
Local Registration of Title (Ireland) (Amendment)		Read 1ª 6th July (1149)

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS—*continued.*

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Marriage Act (Amendment) [H.L.]	*Lord James of Hereford*	Bill withdrawn 30th June (495)
Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies)	*Lord Avebury*	Read 1^{a} 29th June (295)
Nurses Registration [H.L.]	*Lord Ampthill*	Read 2^{a} 6th July (1188)
Police Superannuation	*Lord Newton*	Read 1^{a} 6th July (1149)
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs)		Read 1^{a} 6th July (1149)
Polling Districts (County Councils)		Read 1^{a} 6th July (1149)
Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland)		Read 1^{a} 6th July (1149)
*Post Office Sites [H.L.]	*Earl Granard*	Report 7th July (1419) Re-committed 8th July (1595)
Summary Jurisdiction		Read 1^{a} 6th July (1149)
Tobaccco Growing (Scotland)	*Earl of Camperdown*	Read 1^{a} 29th June (295)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Bail	*Mr. Gladstone*	Read 1^{o} 30th June (591)
*Coal Mines (Eight Hours)	*Mr. Gladstone*	Read 2^{o} 6th July (1261)
*Companies [H.L.]	*Sir H. Kearley*	Read 1^{o} 25th June (116)
Coroners (Inquests)	*Mr. Higham*	Report 3rd July (1144)
Coroners (Ireland)	*Mr. Ffrench.*	Read 1^{o} and passed 7th July (1592)
Education (Local Authorities)	*Mr. Walker*	Report 3rd July (1126)
Education of the Blind	*Mr. Steadman*	Read 1^{o} 29th June (381)
Handloom Weaving (Ireland)	*Mr. Sloan*	Read 2^{o} 3rd July (1144)
Incest	*Sir J. Kennaway*	Report 26th June (278) Read 3^{o} and passed 3rd July (1090)
*Isle of Man (Custom Duties)	*Mr. Hobhouse*	Read 1^{o} 1st July (780)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Law of Distress (Amendment	*Mr. A. Herbert*	Report Read 3° and passed } 3rd July (1101)
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press)	*Mr. A. Henderson*	Report Read 3° and passed } 26th June (233)
Local Authorities (Advertising)	*Sir T. Roe*	Read 1° 7th July (1481)
*Local Government (Ireland)	*Mr Birrell*	Read 1° 2nd July (988)
Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment	*Mr. Muldoon*	Report Read 3° and passed } 2nd July (1080)
Married Women's Property	*Mr. Hicks Beach*	Report 1st July (899)
National Military Training	*Captain Kincaid Smith*	Bill withdrawn 25th June (213)
*Navigation Works (Ireland)	*Mr. T. W. Russell*	Bill withdrawn 6th July (1415)
*Old-age Pensions	*Mr. Lloyd-George*	Committee 29th June (381) Committee 30th June (591) Committee 1st July (781) Re-committed 6th July (1343) Report 7th July (1489)
Police (County Authorities)	*Sir C. Schwann*	Read 1° 25th June (116)
Police Superannuation	*Mr. S. Roberts*	Report Read 3° and passed } 3rd July (1101)
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs)	*Mr. Guinness*	Report 3rd July (1090)
Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland)	*Mr. J. McVeagh*	Report 26th June (290) Report Read 3° and passed } 3rd July (1143)
Polling Districts (County Councils)	*Mr. A. Allen*	Report 26th June (291) Read 3° and passed 3rd July (1039)
Public Health (Sewers and Drains) (No. 2)	*Mr. Vivian*	Read 1° 7th July (1481)
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland)	*Marquess of Hamilton*	Report Read 3° and passed } 3rd July (1106)
Teachers of Music (Registration)	*Mr. O'Neill*	Read 1° 2nd July (988)
Tobacco Growing (Scotland)	*Mr. Morton*	Report Read 3° and passed } 26th June (222)
Urban District Councils (Advertising)	*Sir T. Roe*	Bill withdrawn 2nd July (1080)

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1908.

JUNE 25—JULY 8.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeen

Woodside District Postal Facilities.
Q. Mr. Pirie: *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 8*, 1657.

Aberdour

Fishery Order.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1640.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork County, N.E.]

Buckley Estate—Cases of D. Kelleher and Mrs. E. O'Shea, *July 2*, 939.

Fermoy Court-House, Use of, *July 8*, 1672, 1673.

Grehan Estate Evicted Tenants, *July 3*, 1087.

Kildorrery—Case of J. Magner, *July 7*, 1449.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, Rhondda]

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R. *July 6*, 1301.

Acland, Mr. F. D.—*Financial Secretary to War Office* [Yorkshire, Richmond]

Africa, South—Garrison reduction, *July 8*, 1655.

Irish Rifles, Royal—Strength, Number joining Special Reserve, etc., *July 2*, 947.

Service Corps, Pay of, *July 2*, 949.

Acland, Mr. F. D.—*cont.*

Special Reserve—Exemption from Jury Service, etc., *July 8*, 1655.

Territorial Force Artillery Adjutants, *July 1*, 750.

Volunteers, Orderly-room Clerks, Position of, *July 8*, 1654.

War Office Cloth Contracts, *July 8*, 1653, 1654, 1655.

Tartan Cloth—Place of Manufacture, *July 2*, 948.

Aden

Guard Ship.
Q. Mr. J. W. Wilson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *June 25*, 74.

Adkins, Mr. W. R. [Lancashire, S.E., Middleton].

Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1137.

Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 1*, 861; *July 7*, 1560.

Admiralty

First Lord—Right Hon. R. McKenna.

Financial Secretary—Dr. T. J. Macnamara.

[*cont.*

Admiralty—*cont.*
Coal, Expenditure on.
Qs. Mr. Bowles, Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 6*, 1224.
Contracts—Wages paid by Messrs Armstrong, Whitworth & Co.
Qs. Mr. Hudson; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *June 29*, 341.
Deputations to.
Os. Mr. Jenkins, *July 8*, 1743.
Fires, Loss and Damage by.
Qs. Mr. Hay; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *June 25*, 72.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 2*, 947.
Naval Officers, Senior, Dissensions among.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs, Mr. MacNeill, Capt. Murray; *As.* Mr. *Asquith*, *July 8*, 1652.

Afghanistan
Anglo-Russian Agreement—Attitude of Ameer.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 503, 504, 554; Viscount Morley, 528.
British Policy in.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 502–504; Viscount Morley, 528; Viscount Midleton, 538–540.
Mohmand raid into India, *see* India—Mohmand Rising.
Papers relating to—Tabling, proposed.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 504, 555, 556; Viscount Morley, 555, 556.

Africa, South
[*For particular Colonies, etc., see their Names*, as Transvaal.]
Garrison
Cost of Middelburg Farm, etc.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 29*, 344.
Reduction of.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Acland, *July 8*, 1655.
Police knowledge of Dutch.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 7*, 1458.

Agricultural Holding Acts Consolidation Bill
Date of introducing.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 26*, 221.

Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of
President—Right Hon. Earl Carrington.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Vice-President—Rt. Hon. T. W. Russell.
"Helga," Provision of.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 25*, 56.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]
Argyle and Bute Volunteer Garrison Artillery (1st)—Guns and Officers' Uniforms, etc., *June 25*, 71.
Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 183.

Aire and Calder Navigation Bill
c. Rep. July 7*, 1439.

Alcohol
Industrial Use of, Conditions of Authorising.
Qs. Mr. Nannetti; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 2*, 972.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Borstal System—Extension to Females, *July 2*, 963.
Education—Medical Inspection of Children, Grants for, *July 2*, 967.
Law Courts Accommodation, Inquiry into, proposed, *June 25*, 55.
Motor Omnibus, Accidents in April and May, *July 2*, 962.
Natal—Trial of Dinizulu, *June 25*, 80.
Unemployment Statistics, May, *July 2*, 965.

Alderney
Chefs de Famille, Petitions from.
Qs. Mr. Bowerman; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Burns, *July 8*, 1642.

Allen, Mr. A. A. [Christchurch]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 254.
Notification of Births, Person responsible for, *June 29*, 331.
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1091, 1096, 1097.
Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill, 3R. *July 3*, 1090.

Alnwick
Post Office Drains.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 1*, 743.

Alverstone, Lord—*Lord Chief Justice*
Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill, 2R. *June 25*, 18–20; 3R. *June 30*, 496.
Criminal Procedure—Delays in Cases of Re-trial, *June 29*, 318–320.

Ammanford Urban District Council Water Bill
c. 2R.* *July 6*, 1205.

Ampthill, Lord
India
Administrative Policy, *June 30*, 545–547.

Ampthill, Lord—*cont.*
India—*cont.*
Bengal Unrest due to Partition, alleged, *June 30*, 544.
Press Act, Terms of, *June 30*, 546.
Nurses Registration Bill, 2R. *July 6*, 1188–1197, 1203.

Ancient Monuments
Royal Commission for England and Wales, proposed.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 6*, 1209.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Maj. Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 8*, 1680.

Armagh
Boycott of M. M'Dermott.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. O'Dowd; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 110.

Anson, Sir W. R.—[Oxford University]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 261, 268.

Anstruther-Gray, Major—[St. Andrew's Burghs]
Africa, South—Garrison Reduction, *July 8*, 1655.
Ancient Monuments—Welsh Commission, *July 8*, 1680.
Army
Cavalry
Scotland, Regiments for, *June 29*, 347.
Sword, *July 6*, 1230.
Piershill Barracks, State of, *June 29*, 347.
Cirencester Royal Agricultural Students Medals worn by, *June 25*, 77.
Coastguard — Fife Service, *July 8*, 1650.
Fisheries, Scottish
Cruiser, *June 25*, 96; *July 2*, 974, 975; *July 8*, 1665.
Nets, Inquiry into Size used, proposed, *July 8*, 1752, 1753.
Hamble River Navigation, *July 7*, 1454.
Inverliever Estate, Work on, *July 8*, 1665.
Local Government Scotland (No. 2) Bill, Legislative Proposals for Replacing, *July 2*, 974.
Mall to Charing Cross Improvement, Information as to, *June 30*, 573.
Marble Arch Coffee Stall, Removal of, *June 25*, 55.
Moray Firth Foreign Trawlers—Decision as to enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *June 25*, 84; *July 8*, 1751, 1952.
Morocco
Clark-Kennedy, Mr., Capture of, *June 25*, 89.
Postal Facilities —Cash-on-Delivery System, *July 2*, 967.

Anstruther-Gray, Major—*cont.*
Navy
Grog Ration, Allowance in Lieu of, proposed, *July 1*, 749.
Rosyth Works — Sinking of Cylinder, *July 8*, 1650, 1651.
Persia
Legation Guard, *July 2*, 953; *July 2*, 956, 957.
Situation in, *June 25*, 87; *June 30*, 568, 569.
Tabriz, Situation in, *July 2*, 954.
Tobacco Cultivation, Assistance to, *July*, *7*, 1463.
Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.* *June 26*, 227.
Transvaal Native Labour in Mines — Mortality Statistics, *June 29*, 352.
Tristan d'Acunha, Condition of, *July 2*, 951.
Turkish Building Operations at Awga, *July 7*, 1462.
Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 187-190.
War Office Cloth Contracts, *July 8*, 1655.
Tartan Cloth — Place of Manufacture, *July 2*, 948.

Appellate Jurisdiction Bill
l. 2R. *June 30*, 497.
*Com.** *July 6*, 1204.

"Arcadia"
Capture within German Territorial Limit
Q. Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *June 29*, 355.

Ards Railway Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 3*, 1144.
Con.,* and 3R.* *July 8*, 1629.
l. 1R.* *July 8*, 1593.

Arms Conference
Date of Conclusion, etc.
Qs. Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 955.
Scope of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 8*, 1639.

Army
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Secretary—Lord Lucas.
Financial Secretary—Mr. F. D. Acland.
Arms, Discarded, Disposal of.
Qs. Mr. Rees, *July 2*, 956.
Artillery Establishment.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1234.

Army—*cont.*
- Auxiliary Forces, Strength of.
  - *Q.* Captain Kincaid-Smith; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 7*, 1454.
- Bechuanaland Expedition, Medal for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 25*, 71.
- Cardwell System, Proposals for modifying.
  - *Q.* Mr. A. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 29*, 348.
- Cavalry
  - Scotland, Regiments for.
    - *Qs.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *June 29*, 347.
  - Sword.
    - *Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1230.
- Gillen, J., Case of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 29*, 329.
- Guns, Converted Fifteen-pounder, Shells for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 25*, 65.
- Horses
  - Number required.
    - *Os.* Earl of Donoughmore, *July 6*, 1164; Earl of Erroll, 1173, 1174; Earl Carrington, 1181.
  - Supply of—Tabling Papers proposed.
    - *Os.* Earl of Donoughmore, *July 6*, 1163, 1169.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 7*, 1456.
- Infantry of the Line—Reduction Proposals.
  - *Q.* Major Renton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1233.
- Irish Rifles, Royal—Strength, Number joining Special Reserve, etc.
  - *Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Acland, *July 2*, 947.
- Line Battalions, Strength of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1233.
- Marines, Royal, *see that title.*
- Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those titles.*
- Officers
  - Orders bestowed in 1907.
    - *Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 29*, 329.
  - Territorial Force, *see that subheading.*
- Piershill Barracks, State of.
  - *Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 29*, 347.
- Reconnaissances, Cause for stopping.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1231.
- Service Corps, Pay of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Howard; *A.* Mr. Acland, *July 2*, 949.
- Soldiers—Penal Servitude Cases in 1907.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. C. Lea; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 29*, 344,

Army—*cont.*
- Special Reserve
  - Exemption from Jury Service, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Acland, *July 8*, 1655.
  - Seargeants-Major, Position of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 7*, 1457.
  - Transfers to.
    - *Q.* Major Renton; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1232.
- Territorial Force (*see also titles* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry.)
  - Artillery Adjutants.
    - *Q.* Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Acland *July 1*, 750.
  - Boots, Provision of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Herbert; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 8*, 1649.
  - Brigade Staff Allowances.
    - *Os.* Lord Lovat, *July 8*, 1615; Lord Lucas, 1622.
  - Classification of Marksmen.
    - *Q.* Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 25*, 65.
  - Enlistments.
    - *Qs.* Mr. W. Thorne, Mr. Ashley, ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1227.
  - Horses—Conditions attached to Grant.
    - *Os.* Lord Lovat, *July 8*, 1615; Lord Lucas, 1623.
  - Medical Examination—Reduction of Fees.
    - *Os.* Lord Lovat, *July 8*, 1616; Lord Lucas, 1624.
  - Mobilisation Arrangements.
    - *Os.* Lord Lovat, *July 8*, 1617; Lord Lucas, 1625.
  - Officers, Experience of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 25*, 65.
  - Permanent Staff Grievances.
    - *Os.* Lord Lovat, *July 8*, 1614; Lord Lucas, 1622.
  - Regulations Presented, *July 2*, 902; *July 3*, 1082.
  - Special Reserve, *see that title.*
  - Strength of.
    - *Qs.* Captain Kincaid-Smith; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 7*, 1454.
  - Training kit, Economies effected in.
    - *Os.* Lord Lovat, *July 8*, 1616; Lord Lucas, 1623.
  - West Riding Enlistments.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 7*, 1456.
- War Office, *see that title.*
- Woolwich Arsenal, *see that title.*

Army Estimates
- Clothing Vote, Date of Taking.
  - *Q.* Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 29*, 379.
- Vote 12, Date of Taking.
  - *Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 8*, 1681.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]
  Army—Line Battalions, *July 6*, 1235.
  Navy
    Education and Training.
      Cost to Parents, *July 8*, 1718.
      Interchangeability System, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 8*, 1716–1720.
    Mechanicians—New Training Scheme *July 8*, 1720–1723.

Ashbourne, Lord
  Board of Trade (Provisional Orders) Bill 2R., *July 7*, 1423.
  Condition of, *July 7*, 1432–1435.
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com. July 8*, 1603.
  Proclaimed Counties in Ireland—Method of Allocating Extra Expenditure Involved by Disturbances, *July 7*, 1432–1435.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. [Lancashire, Blackpool]
  Army
    Artillery Establishment, *July 6*, 1234
    Line Battalions, Strength of, *July 6*, 1233.
    Reconnaissances, Value of, *July 6*, 1231.
    Territorial Force Enlistments, *July 6*, 1227.
  Ceylon Public Works—Employment of Natives, *June 25*, 81, 82.
  Egyptian Newspaper Statement on Soudan Disturbance, *July 7*, 1459.
  Hamble River Navigation, *July 7*, 1452–1454.
  Morocco—Capture of Mr. Clark-Kennedy, *June 25*, 89.
  Navy
    Casualties Return, Continuance of *June 25*, 74.
    Collisions, Record of, *June 29*, 343.
    Dockyards—Territorial Army Service of Employees, *June 25*, 73; *July 1*, 749, 750; *July 6*, 1226.
    Estimates, Time Allotted to, *June 25*, 74; *June 29*, 342, 343; *July 1*, 747.
    "Highflyer," Repairs to, *July 1*, 747.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. June 30*, 659–662, 667.
  Volunteer Permanent Staff Pay under New Scheme, *June 29*, 347.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*First Lord of the Treasury*, [Fifeshire, E.]
  Ancient Monuments—Royal Commission for England and Wales, *July 6*, 1209; *July 8*, 1680.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
  Army Estimates
    Clothing Vote, Date of Taking, *June 29*, 379;
    Discussion of Vote 12, *July 8*, 1682.
  Autumn Session, Proposals as to, *July 2*, 985; *July 7*, 1479.
  Banks, Scottish—Judges as Directors, *July 6*, 1211.
  Budget, Proposals as to, *July 1*, 777.
  Business of the House, Course of, *July 2*, 986, 987; *July 7*, 1480.
  Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Date of taking, *June 29*, 380.
  Condition of Ireland — Government Attitude, *June 30*, 585, 586.
  Daylight Saving Bill, Facilities for, *July 8*, 1683.
  Foreign Office Vote, Date of taking, *July 1*, 775.
  Income-Tax, Payment on Renewal of Leases, *June 30*, 590.
  Indian Reform Proposals, Date of Submitting, *June 25*, 114.
  Irish Estimates, Time Allotted to, *July 8*, 1681.
  Irish Universities Bill, Proposals as to, *June 30*, 588.
  Licensing Bill
    Ninety-Nine Year Leases, Application to, *July 7*, 1478, 1479.
    Wine Trade, Application to, *July 7*, 1480.
  Liquor Traffic—Wine and Spirit Merchants' Licences, *July 2*, 985.
  Lords-Lieutenant, System of Appointing, *July 8*, 1682.
  Meat Supply—Inquiry proposed, *July 8*, 1680.
  Navy Estimates
    Time Allotted to, *June 25*, 74.
    Vote 5, Discussion of, *July 1*, 776.
  Officers, dissensions among, *July 8*, 1652, 1653.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 471, 474; *June 30*, 595, 597, 598, 600; *July 6*, 1349; *July 7*, 1531, 1536; *July 6*, 1406–1408.
    Proposals as to, *July 2*, 985.
  Parliamentary Electoral Reform Proposals, *July 2*, 985; *July 8*, 1679.
  Poor Law Royal Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *July 6*, 1260.
  Postmaster-General, Assistance to, by Lord Granard, etc., *June 25*, 113, 114.
  Scottish Estimates, Time Allotted to, *June 29*, 380; *June 30*, 561; *July 1*, 777.
  Speeches, Duration of, *June 29*, 379.

[*cont*

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
Spies, Legislative Proposals for Dealing with, *July 8*, 1681.
Sugar—Brussels Convention Additional Act, Procedure in Ratifying, *July 1*, 776.
Sunday Trading—Legislative Proposals, *June 29*, 379.
Tied Trades, Legislation to Deal with, proposed, *June 30*, 589.
Tobacco Cultivation, Assistance to, *July 7*, 1479.
Trade, Board of—Date of taking Vote *July 6*, 1259, 1260.
Unemployed Grants, *July 6*, 1260.
Vickers, Sons & Maxim, Messrs.—Indentures of Apprentices, *June 30*, 590.

Assizes and Quarter Sessions Bill
l. Rep. * *June 26*, 495 ; *July 1*, 737.
3R. * *July 2*, 930.

Atkinson, Lord
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com. July 8*, 1595–1599, 1605, 1609, 1610.

Attorney-General—*Sir W. S. Robson.*

Attorney-General for Ireland
Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry

Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Sussex, Lewes]
Income-Tax Appeals, Procedure in Hearing, *July 7*, 1462.

Audenshaw Urban District Council Bill
c. 3R.* *June 26*, 217.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* * *June 29*, 294.

Australia
[*See also Names of States.*]
Harvester Excise Act, decision as to.
Q. Mr. Devlin ; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 6*, 1215.
Naval Defence Scheme.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 29*, 352.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond ; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 2*, 946.
Shop Hours Acts—Report presented, *July 1*, 731, 739.
Wages Boards, etc.—Report presented, *July 1*, 731, 739.

Autumn Session
Proposals as to.
Q. Captain Craig ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 2*, 984.
Qs. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth, Captain Craig ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 7*, 1479.

Ayr
Prison—Complaint by Warder.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 1*, 743.

Bail Bill
c. 1R.* *June 30*, 591.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, N., Chorley]
Education
Secondary School Grants (1907–8), *June 30*, 576, 577.
Waivers—Applications received in 1907–8, *July 2*, 942.
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1127–1129, 1143.
Inverliever Estate, Work on, etc., *July 8*, 1664.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. June 29*, 453–455 ; *June 30*, 666 ; *July 1*, 841, 842.
Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 231.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [City of London]
Business of the House, Course of, *July 2*, 986, *July 7*, 1480.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. June 29*, 399–404 ; *June 30*, 596, 642, 643, 652–655 ; *July 1*, 780, 815–817, 819–822 ; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1502, 1523–1525, 1531, 1543, 1544, 1547, 1572, 1575.
Division—Doors in "No" Lobby Locked while Members were still entering "Aye" Lobby, *June 30*, 698.
Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 148–157, 208.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
Criminal Procedure—Delays in Cases of Re-trial, *June 29*, 315.
Land Values (Scotland) Bill, *Rep. July 3*, 911–916, 927.

Balintore Harbour
State of
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1660.

Ballinclare
Case of A. Carton.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 2*, 943.

Ballygibbon
Case of J. D. M'Auliffe.
Q. Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 1222.

Ballymahon
Unlawful Assembly Case—Signing of Summonses.
Q. Captain Craig ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 99.

Ballyvackey Farm
Case of P. Hayes.
Q. Mr. E. Barry; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 1*, 771.

Banbury, Sir F. [City of London]
Budget Proposals as to, *July 1*, 777.
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1134.
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1105.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 234, 237, 238, 241, 255, 263, 275, 276, 278.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 3R. *June 30*, 712.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. June 29*, 382, 393, 432, 466; *June 30*, 599, 626, 637, 652; *July 1*, 860, 864–866; *Con.*, *July 6*, 1367; *July 7*, 1492–1494, 1510, 1534, 1540, 1554–1556, 1567; *Recom. July 6*, 1381.
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1090, 1092, 1098, 1100.
Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill, 3R. *July 3*, 1090.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1106–1112, 1114–1116, 1119, 1123, 1126.
Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 222, 231, 232.

Banchory
Postal Facilities.
Q. Captain A. Murray; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6*, 1216.

Bangor, Bishop of
Merchant Shipping
Desertions in Foreign Ports, 1904–1908—Return proposed, *June 29*, 306.
Sunday Labour, Regulations as to, *June 29*, 308.

Bank of Ireland
Government Relations with.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 8*, 1677.

Bankruptcy
Case of G. H. Taylor.
Qs. Mr. Richardson; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 1*, 762.

Banks
Irish Notes, Commission Charged on.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 30*, 588; *July 6*, 1258.
Scottish—Judges as Directors.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 6*, 1210.

Banks—*cont.*
Unclaimed Balances.
Qs. Mr. Watt, Mr. Younger; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Speaker, *June 25*, 94.
Compulsory Statement, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 25*, 64.
Estimate of.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. Bottomley; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Speaker, *June 29*, 357.
Practice in Classing Accounts as Unclaimed.
Q. Mr. A. Chamberlain; *A.* Mr. Lloyd - George, *June 29*, 358.

Baring, Mr. G. [Isle of Wight]
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con. July 3*, 1140, 1143.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 237.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1109, 1110.

Baring, Mr. G. V. [Winchester]
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1123.

Barnard, Mr. E. B. [Kidderminster]
Malt Importation (1903–1907), *July 3*, 1086.
South-Western Suburban Water Bill, 3R. *June 30*, 728.

Barnes, Mr. G. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Glasgow Unemployed—Opportunity for Discussion, *July 8*, 1782.
Navy
Education and Training.
Cost to Parents, *July 8*, 1637.
Interchangeability System — Inquiry proposed, *July 8*, 1684–1686, 1690.
Mechanicians — New Training Scheme, *July 8*, 1688–1694, 1705.
Navy Estimates — Discussion of Vote 5, *July 1*, 776.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 1*, 795; *July 7*, 1501, 1521–1523, 1566.
Osborne College, Cost of, *July 8*, 1686.
Scottish Estimates, Time Allotted to, *June 25*, 216; *June 29*, 380; *July 1*, 777.

Barra, Island of
Exodus of Crofters to Vatersay, *see* Vatersay and Barra.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
Dairies, etc., Order, Protests against, *July 3*, 1088.

[*cont.*

Barrie, Mr. H. T.—*cont.*
  Education
    King's Scholarship Examination, Females Passing, *July 2*, 982.
    National School Teachers' Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2*, 1024.

Barry, Mr. E. [Cork County, S.]
  Ballyvackey Farm—Case of P. Hayes, *July 1*, 771.
  Castleventry—Case of Representatives of P. Donovan, *June 29*, 376.

Barry, Mr R.—*Solicitor-General for Ireland* [Tyrone, N.]
  Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con. July 3*, 1108, 1111, 1113, 1115, 1117, 1121, 1125.

Barry Railway Bill
  c. *Rep.* July 7*, 1440.

Beach, Mr. M. H. [Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury]
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con., July 6*, 1346–1348.

Beauchamp, Earl
  Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill, 2R. *July 7*, 1419.

Beauchamp, Mr. E. [Suffolk, Lowestoft]
  Naval Interchangeability System—Inquiry proposed, *July 8*, 1723, 1724.

Beck, Mr A. C. [Cambridgeshire, Wisbech]
  Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R. *July 6*, 1279–1281.

Bedford, Duke of
  Militiamen who have not Enlisted in the Special Reserve, Position of, *July 1*, 734.

Belfast
  Hibernian Excursion, Stone Thrown at. *Qs.* Mr. Devlin, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 108.
  Licensed Houses under Police Observation. *Q.* Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 938.
  Prison Officers, Hours of Duty of. *Q.* Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 337.
  Schools in Circuit 8, Reports on. *Q.* Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 338.
  Tramway Accounts. *Q.* Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 68.
  Workhouse
    Admissions. *Q.* Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell *July 2*, 939.
    Report on. *Q.* Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 980.

Belgium
  Antwerp—Shipping Fee System. *Q.* Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *June 29*, 324.
  Cost of Living, Inquiry as to. *Q.* Mr. James Hope; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 6*, 1249.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]
  Army Officers—Orders Bestowed in 1907, *June 29*, 329.
  Navy
    Casualties Return, Continuance of, *June 25*, 75.
    Collisions, Record of, *June 29*, 344.
    Dockyard Employees, Territorial Army Service of, *July 1*, 750.
    Education and Training
      Cadets and Complements of Training Cruisers, *June 26*, 220.
      Cost to Parents, *July 8*, 1701.
      Interchangeability System, *July 8*, 1695–1703.
    "Irresistible"—Report on Flooding of Engine-Room, *July 1*, 748.
    Officers
      Dissensions Among, *July 8*, 1652, 1653.
      Orders Bestowed on, in 1907, *June 29*, 333.
  Navy Estimates
    Time Allotted to, *June 29*, 343.
    Vote 5, Discussion of, *July 1*, 776.

Belper, Lord
  Education—Increase in Cost, *June 25*, 30–33.
  Roads, Main—Cost of Upkeep, *June 25*, 30.
  Taxation, Local—Increased Burdens Thrown on Rates, etc., *June 25*, 29–35.

"Bengore Head," s.s.
  Accidents to, in Portsmouth Harbour, Causes of.
    Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 1*, 732; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 733; Lord Ellenborough, 734.

Bennett, Mr. E. N. [Oxfordshire, Woodstock]
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. July 1*, 781, 783.
  Small Holdings
    Credit Banks, Necessity for, *June 29*, 368.
    House Erection Proposals, *June 29*, 368.
    Refusals, Appeals Against, *June 29*, 368.
    Schemes
      Acreage Supplied, *July 8*, 1645.
      Date for Submitting, *June 29*, 366, 367.
      Number Received, *June 29*, 367.

Bethell, Mr. T. R. [Essex, Maldon]
- Poor Law Union Buildings, Loans for Extending, *July 1*, 745.

Bethell, Sir J. H. [Essex, Romford]
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. June 29*, 451.

Bignold, Sir A. [Wick Burghs]
- Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con., June 26*, 254.
- Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to Enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1744–1748.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, N.]
- Armagh—Boycott of M. McDermott, *June 25*, 110.
- Ballygibbon—McAuliffe Case, *July 6*, 1222.
- Ballymahon Unlawful Assembly Case—Signing of Summonses, *June 25*, 99.
- Belfast
  - Hibernian Excursion, Stone Thrown at, *June 25*, 108.
  - Licensed Houses under Police Observation, *July 2*, 938.
  - Prison Officers, Hours of Duty of, *June 29*, 337.
  - Schools in Circuit 8, Reports on, *June 29*, 338.
  - Tramway Accounts, *June 25*, 68.
  - Workhouse
    - Admissions, *July 2*, 939.
    - Report on, *July 2*, 980.
- Buckley Estate—Cases of D. Kelleher and Mrs. E. O'Shea, *July 2*, 940.
- Burns Hartopp Estate Tenants, Position of, *June 25*, 53.
- Castlefrench Estate—Cattle-drive on 16th inst., *July 2*, 977.
- Castleventry—Case of Representatives of P. Donovan, *June 29*, 376.
- Cattle-drives—Attitude of the Government, *June 25*, 101.
- Claremount Estate, Disposal of, *July 6*, 1222.
- Cloncurry Estate, Situation on, *July 2*, 978.
- Clouncon—Case of J. Kenney, *July 8*, 1649.
- Condition of Ireland—Government Attitude, *June 30*, 584, 585.
- Congested Districts Board Works, Cause for Stoppage of, *July 2*, 984; *July 7*, 1475, 1476.
- Consumption in Ireland, *July 8*, 1648.
- Coonana Pier, Lighting of, *June 25*, 55.
- Cork Corporation Surcharges, *June 30*, 587.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Croughteeri—Case of J. Murphy, *June 29*, 341.
- Crown Jewels, Loss of, *July 2*, 979.
- Dairies, etc., Order, Protests against, *July 3*, 1088, 1089.
- Delmage Estate, Sale Proposals, *June 25*, 111.
- Dickson Estate—Disposal of Mulcair Lands, *July 2*, 977.
- Dundrum Estate, Situation on, *June 25*, 100.
- Dunfanaghy Labourers Act Inquiry, *June 26*, 221.
- Education
  - Amalgamation Regulations, *July 8*, 1647.
  - Attendance under thirty-five, Cases of, *June 29*, 327.
  - Christian Brothers Schools, Pupils in and grants to, *July 2*, 1071, 1072.
  - Grant, Additional, Distribution of, *July 2*, 976; *July 3*, 1089.
  - Intermediate
    - Grant, *July 6*, 1223.
    - Inspectorate, *June 25*, 103.
    - Rules, *June 25*, 68.
  - King's Scholarship Examination, Females passing, *July 2*, 982.
  - MacMillan, Mr., Reports of, *June 29*, 339.
  - National School Teachers.
    - Civil Rights of, *July 2*, 1037 *July 8*, 1648.
    - Dismissals, Regulations as to *July 2*, 1073.
    - Liquor Licences, Regulations as to Teachers having connection with, *July 2*, 1074.
    - Salary increase, Conditions of granting, *July 2*, 997, 1060–1069.
    - Transition Teachers, Grievances of, *June 25*, 67.
    - University Lecture Courses, *July 6*, 1222.
  - Scholarships, etc., Grants for, *July 6*, 1221.
  - School, Roll No. 1950, Circuit 9, Section A, Teaching in *July 3*, 1086.
  - Schools.
    - Amalgamation Proposals, *July 2*, 1063.
    - Sanitary Conditions and Heating Arrangements, *July 2*, 1070, 1071.
  - Training Applications for one year's course, *June 29*, 340.
- Ennis County Court—Compensation awarded for malicious injuries to Cattle, *June 25*, 109.

[cont.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act, Working of, *June 30*, 560.

Evictions—System of dealing with Reinstatement applications, *June 29* 339.

Fairs, Regulation of, *July 7*, 1451.

Foiladown—Case of J. Healy, *June 29*, 376.

Galway, Condition of, *June 25*, 100.

Glenakill, South—Case of Mrs. J. Guiney, *July 2*, 937.

Goraghwood Excursion Train—Cause for stoppage in Tunnel, *June 25*, 107.

Gore-Booth Estate, Sale of, *July 7*, 1450.

Granard—Case of Cuffe Children, *June 29*, 340.

Greencastle—Police Visits to Public-houses, *June 29*, 336.

Grehan Estate, Evicted Tenants, *July 3*, 1088.

Griffith Estate, Sale Proposals, *June 30*, 588.

Gurtienminogue—Case of B. Radford, *June 30*, 561.

Inchiquin Estate—Sale Proposals, *July 2*, 978.

Irish Universities Bill

  Extern Students, *June 29*, 327.

  Proposals as to, *June 30*, 586.

Kilbrin—Case of J. Nash, *July 2*, 936.

Kildorrery—Case of J. Magner, *July 7*, 1449.

Kiltoghert Cattle-drive—Decision as to Prosecution, *June 25*, 109, 110.

Knockanes—Case of D. Healy, *June 25*, 105.

Labourers (Ireland) Act

  Section 6 (2), Interpretation of, *June 25*, 105.

  Transactions under, *June 29*, 328.

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887—Repeal of Section 7, proposed, *June 25*, 106, 107.

Land Purchase

  Annuities Collectable, *June 30*, 561.

  Transactions, *June 26*, 219; *July 6*, 1220.

Leitrim—Case of P. Lyons, *June 25*, 98, 99.

Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898—Section 122 (2), *July 2*, 941.

Longford Evicted Tenants, *July 6*, 1220.

McCartie Estate, Sale Proposals, *June 25*, 104.

Maghera Constabulary Transfers, *July 2*, 938.

Maybery Estate Evicted Tenants, *June 25*, 55.

Monaghan Estate—Disposal of Untenanted Land, *June 25*, 102.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

Newry—Extra Police on 21st Inst., *June 29*, 377.

Nolan Estate Cattle-drives, *June 25*, 98.

O'Connell Estate Tenants, Position of, *July 8*, 1647.

Outrages Reported in May, *June 25*, 99, 100.

Poor Law

  Paupers—Deportation System, *July 2*, 981.

  Reform Proposals, *July 2*, 982.

Portarlington School Inspector, *June 29*, 338.

Proclamation of Irish Counties, Effect of, *June 25*, 101.

Rathdowney Disturbance on 20th Inst., *June 29*, 328.

Rathruddy—Outrage at House of M. Glynn, *June 25*, 109.

Reask Cattle-drive on 26th Ult., *June 29*, 335.

Rockfield—Case of J. Burke, *June 25*, 104.

Smythe Estate—Case of Mrs. Riggs, *June 25*, 66.

Taumagh Farm—Cattle-drives in May and June, *June 29*, 335.

Teenan's Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 2*, 940.

Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Sale Proposals, *June 29*, 339.

West Estate—Case of P. Kelley, *July 7*, 1450.

Williams Estate—Case of D. Curran, *June 25*, 67.

Birthday Honours

Rosette to be worn by Recipients, proposed.

  Os. Mr. W. Redmond, *June 29*, *380*.

Bishops, Lydeard

Small Holdings Inquiry.

  Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 30*, 579.

Blackburn Corporation Bill

c. 3R.* *June 26*, 217.

l. 2R.* *July 6*, 1145.

Blaydon and Ryton Water (Transfer) Bill

c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*,* *July 3*, 1081.

Board of Trade (Provisional Orders) Bill

l. 1R.* *June 29*, 294.

  2R., *July 7*, 1421.

Bognor Gas, Light, and Coke Company Bill

c. *Rep.** *July 7*, 1439.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]

Burns Hartopp Estate, Tenants, Position of, *June 25*, 53.

Coonana Pier, Lighting of, *June 25*, 55.

[*cont.*

Boland, Mr. J. P.—*cont.*
Maybery Estate, Evicted Tenants, *June 25*, 54.
O'Connell Estate Tenants, Position of, *July 8*, 1646.
Southampton—Recognition of St. Anne's School, *June 29*, 365, 366.
Trade Commissioner for certain Colonies, *July 7*, 1476.
Trade Mark as evidence of origin, acceptance of, *June 30*, 571.
Trade Statistics, accuracy of, *June 25*, 57.
Williams Estate—Case of D. Curran, *June 25*, 67.

Bolton
Post Office Telephonist, Case of.
Q. Mr. Gill; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *June 25*, 69.

Bottomley, Mr. W. H. [Hackney, S.]
Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Estimate of, *June 29*, 358, 359.
Income-Tax
Assessment of Betting Profits, *July 7*, 1464.
Leases, Payment on Renewal of, *June 30*, 590.
Montenegro—British Representation, *June 25*, 84.
Servia, British Relations with, *June 25*, 85.
Tied Trades, Legislation to deal with, proposed, *June 30*, 589.
Unclaimed Property — Compulsory disclosure, proposed, *June 25*, 59.

Bowerman, Mr. C. W. [Deptford]
Alderney *Chefs de Famille*, Petitions from, July, *July 8*, 1642, 1643.
Cattle—Shortage in Supply, *June 25*, 59.
Income-Tax Returns of American Beef Trust, *July 8*, 1659.
Meat Supply—Inquiry proposed, *June 30*, 582, 583.
Motors—Use of Speedometers, *July 1*, 755.
Tramways—Use of Speedometers, *July 1*, 765.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, N.]
Admiralty—Expenditure on Coal, *July 6*, 1224.
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill—Date of taking Ballot, by Miners' Federation, *July 2*, 964.
Naval Casualties Return, continuance of, *June 25*, 76.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com. June 29*, 456–458; *July 1*, 800-803, 835, 839, 844, 847; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1389; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1520, 1530, 1553, 1563–1565, 1572, 1574.

Bowles, Mr. G. S.—*cont.*
Old-age Pensions Bill—*cont.*
Government Amendments of which Notice had not been given, Propriety of Closuring, *June 30*, 697, 709.
War Office Expenditure on Coal, *July 6*, 1232.

Boyne, Viscount
Representative Peer for Ireland, *July 6*, 1145; *July 7*, 1417.

Brace, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, S.]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R. *July 6*, 1301.

Bramsdon, Mr. T. A. [Portsmouth]
Greenwich Hospital Pension Grievances, *July 8*, 1742, 1743.
Naval Stewards and Cooks, Pension Claims of, *July 7*, 1446.

Brazil
Trade Report Presented, *July 1*, 730.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 383, 425; *July 1*, 860; *July 7*, 1560, 1561.

Bristol
Post Office Extension — Wages paid by Contractor.
Q. Mr. W. Thorne; *A.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 2*, 968.
Telegraph Office Vacancies.
Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 1*, 740.

Bristol Corporation Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 25*, 49.
Con.,* *July 6*, 1205.

Bristol Tramways Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 25*, 49.
Con,* *June 29*, 321.
3R.* *July 2*, 931.

British Columbia
Coastal Trading by United States Vessels.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 29*, 353.

British Guiana
See Guiana, British.

British Honduras.
See Honduras, British.

British Medical Association.
Statues on New Building.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *June 29*, 325.

Briton Ferry Urban District Council Bill
c. *Con.*,* *July 3*, 1081.
3R.* *July 7*, 1439.

Brodie, Mr. H. C. [Surrey, Reigate]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *re Com.*, *July 6*, 1401.
Postal Officials, Territorial Training Leave for, *July 6*, 1217.
Surrey Small Holdings Applications, *June 29*, 334.

Bromley and Crays Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *June 29*, 293.
c. Lords Amendts. *Con.*,* *July 3*, 1081.

Brooke, Mr. G. S. [Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley]
Old-age Pensions Bill—Selection of Pension Officers, *July 7*, 1448.

Brunner, Rt. Hon. Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
Women's Suffrage Movement — Treatment accorded to arrested Persons, *July 1*, 757.

Bryce, Mr. J. A. [Inverness Burghs]
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in — Decision as to enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1755.
Scottish Estimates, Time allotted to, *July 1*, 777.
Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 190–192.

Buccleugh
Fishery Order.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1640.

Buchanan, Rt. Hon. T. R.—*Under Secretary for India* [Perthshire, E.]
Army
Medals for recent Operations, Award of, *June 25*, 80.
Scottish Regiments, Disposition of, *July 8*, 1656.
Assam-Bengal Railway, Thefts on, *July 2*, 949.
Bengal, Partition of—Local Opinion, *June 29*, 348, 349.
Budget, Date of Taking, *July 7*, 1444.
Calcutta
Assassination of Constable, *June 30*, 559.
Model Liquor Shops Scheme, *June 25*, 77.
Scottish Mission Church Steps, Bomb found on, *June 30*, 563.
Chittagong Jetty Fires, *July 2*, 949.
Cirencester Royal Agricultural Students, Medals Worn by, *June 25*, 76, 77.
Eastern Bengal and Assam Era, Statements Published in, *June 30*, 565.
Franco-British Exhibition — Indian Subsidy Exhibits, *June 30*, 563, 564.
Jasdan Succession, *July 8*, 1644.

Buchanan, Rt. Hon. T. R.—*cont.*
Madras Landed Estates Bill—Sanction of Indian Government, *July 2*, 950.
Mohmand Rising
Papers, Issue of, *June 30*, 565.
Troops Engaged, *June 29*, 328.
Opium Trade—Restriction of Poppy Cultivation, *June 25*, 78.
Persia—Payment of Cost of Legation Guards, *July 2*, 950.
Postal Service, *July 7*, 1457, 1458.
Press Act VII. of 1908
Interpretation of, *June 25*, 78, 79.
Report of Debates on, *June 30*, 565.
Ramchandra Naryen Mendlik, Case of, *June 29*, 349, 350.
Simla Scheme, *June 29*, 349.
Sugar, Cane—Production Statistics, *June 25*, 76.
Thakur Bahadur Singh and Thakur Ram Singh, Cases of, *July 1*, 751, 752.
Tibet Roads from India, Grant for Improving, *July 2*, 950.

Buckie Burgh and Buckie (Cluny) Harbour Order Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *June 25*, 48.
Con.,* *June 29*, 321.
3R.* *July 1*, 737.

Buckley Estate
Cases of D. Kelleher and Mrs. E. O'Shea.
Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 939.

Budget
[*For Details of Debate, see Titles of Subjects as* Old-age Pensions.]
Proposals as to.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 1*, 777.

Building Societies Acts
Report Presented, *July 6*, 1148, 1208.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster]
South-Western Suburban Water Bill, 3R. *June 30*, 722.
Westminster Church Army March on 4th April, Drunkenness Observed during, *July 2*, 961, 962.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
Alderney *Chefs de Famille*, Petition from, *July 8*, 1643.
Erith Unemployed Grant, *July 7*, 1469.
Housing, Town-Planning, etc., Bill, Proposals as to, *July 6*, 1251.
Local Authorities' Accounts, Audit of, *July 7*, 1467.

[*cont.*

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
  Motor Speed-Limit in London, *July 7*, 1468.
  Notification of Births Act
    Persons Responsible for Notification, *June 29*, 332.
    Towns Adopting, *July 7*, 1447.
  Poor Law Union Buildings, Loans for Extending, *July 1*, 745.
  Reinforced Concrete—Use of Coal Residues, *July 1*, 741.
  Road Maintenance Necessitated by Heavy Motor Traffic, *July 7*, 1467.
  Thames, Places Abutting on—List proposed, *June 29*, 333.
  Unemployment, Proposals for Dealing with, *July 6*, 1251.

Burns Hartopp Estate
  Tenants, Position of.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 53.

Bury and District Joint Water Board Bill
  l. 3R.* *June 25*, 2.

Business of the House
  Course of.
    Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Asquith, Mr. James Hope, Mr. Weir, *July 2*, 986; Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Asquith, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. W. Redmond, *July 7*, 1480.

Bustard Estate
  Sale Proposals.
    Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 1*, 771.

Butcher, Mr. S. H. [Cambridge University]
  Education
    National School Teachers' Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2*, 1028.
    School Amalgamation Proposals, *July 2*, 1029, 1030.

Butter
  Nut Butter, Description Authorised for.
    Q. Earl of Ronaldshay; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 8*, 1659.

Butter and Margarine Act
  Operation of, in Scotland.
    Q. Mr. Flynn. *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 7*, 1477.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General*, [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
  Aberdeen—Woodside Postal Facilities, *July 8*, 1658.
  Alnwick Post Office Drains, *July 1*, 743.
  Banchory Postal Facilities, *July 6*, 1216.
  Bolton Telephonist, Case of, *June 25*, 69.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*
  Bristol Telegraph Office Vacancies, *July 1*, 740.
  Classification of Certain Offices, *July 2*, 942.
  Crumlin Post Office Charge Clerk, *July 6*, 1209.
  Dundee Postal Staff—Cost of Living, *July 2*, 933.
  Engineer-in-Chief's Office—Hours of Clerks, *July 3*, 1083.
  Foynes—Telegraphic Address of O'Connor, *July 8*, 1678.
  Hull Post Office—Split Duties, *July 6*, 1216.
  Irish Mail Conveyance, *June 25*, 112.
  Linesmen, Promotion of, *July 3*, 1083.
  Mail Conveyance, Railway Charge for, *July 2*, 934.
  Medical Attendance of Post Office Employees, *June 30*, 573.
  Morocco Postal Facilities—Cash-on-Delivery System, *July 2*, 967.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 466, 467; *July 6*, 1348; *July 7*, 1558, 1562, 1563, 1567, 1570.
  Postmasters, Sub—Remuneration of, *June 30*, 575.
  Railway Facilities for Employees on Early Duty, *June 25*, 94.
  Savings Bank
    Assistant Clerks, Hours of, *July 3*, 1083.
    Deposits (1903–7), *July 7*, 1469.
    Unclaimed Balances, Record of, *June 30*, 574.
  Stores Contracts Placed in Ireland, *July 7*, 1444, 1445; *July 8*, 1633.
  Substitutes during Camp Training, Provision of, *June 25*, 93.
  Superannuation (Post Office and War Office) Act.
    Retirement Age, *July 6*, 1210.
    Return under Clause 5, *July 6*, 1210.
  Telegraph Service
    Boy Messengers, Discharge of, *June 25*, 113.
    Reply Paid Unused Forms, *July 2*, 942.
  Telephone Mouthpieces, Disease Germs in, *June 29*, 363, 364; *June 30*, 575, 576; *July 6*, 1251.
  Territorial Training Leave for Officials, *July 6*, 1217.
  Vaccination Regulations, *July 3*, 1084.
  Woolfardisworthy Postal Facilities, *July 8*, 1657.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N.]
  District Railway Company—Complaints against Carriage Doors, *June 25*, 90.
  Education, Primary, Condition of, *July 2*, 1078, 1079.

Byles, Mr. W. P.—*cont.*
  British Guiana—Circular as to Militia, *July 1,* 753.
  Limerick Competitions, Legality of, *June 25,* 58.
  Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con., June 26,* 247, 262, 267.
  Thames Conservancy, Powers and Position of, *July 1,* 761.

Cabs
  Motor and Horse Cabs in London.
    Q. Mr. J. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 2,* 934.
  Taximeter
    Seating Accommodation.
      Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 8,* 1633.
    Speed of.
      Q. Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Gladstone. *July 6,* 1244.

Camborne Water Bill
  l. Rep. July 7,* 1417.

Cambrian Railways Bill
  c. Rep. June 25,* 49.
    Con., June 29,* 321.
    3R.* *July 2,* 931.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M. [Dublin University.]
  Clare, State of, *July 8,* 1671.
  Education
    National School Teachers' Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2,* 1014–1018.
    Schools —Amalgamation Proposals, *July 2,* 1016.
  Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 3,* 1109, 1112, 1119, 1123.

Camperdown, Earl of
  Land Values (Scotland) Bill, *Rep. July 3,* 902–907, 925.

Canada
  [*See also* Names of States.]
  Boundary Demarcation—Treaty with United States, presented, *July 1,* 731, 739.
  Militia, Ross Rifle for.
    Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6,* 1214.
  Tariff Convention with France—Tabling of Correspondence.
      Q. Sir F. Sassoon; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *June 30,* 568.

Canary Islands
  Trade Report Presented, *June 25,* 3.

Cardiff Railway Bill
  c. 3R.* *June 25,* 48.
  l. Commons Amendts., *Con.,* June 29,* 293.

Carlile, Mr. E. H. [Herts., St. Albans]
  Army
    Guns, Converted Fifteen-Pounder, Shells for, *June 25,* 65.
    Territorial Force
      Classification of Marksmen, *June 25,* 65.
      Officers, Experience of, *June 25,* 65.
  Companies (Consolidation) Bill, Effect on Existing Law, *July 1,* 762.
  Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con., June 26,* 234, 236, 261, 276.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con., June 30,* 643. *July 6,* 1345, 1351; *July 7,* 1531.
  Tobacco Cultivation, Assistance to, *July 7,* 1463, 1464.
  Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con., June 26,* 229, 233.
  Woolwich Arsenal—Boys Employed, *June 25,* 66.

Carr-Gomm, Mr. H. W. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]
  Street Traffic—Regulation of Routes of Vehicles, *July 1,* 756.

Carrington, Earl—*President of the Board of Agriculture*
  Commons Bill, 2R. *July 2,* 928, 929.
  Horses
    Army—Number required, *July 6,* 1181.
    Breeding
      Government Action, Necessity for, *July 6,* 1184–1197.
      Registration of Stock, Scheme for, *July 6,* 1184.
      Report and Recommendations of Royal Commission, *July 6,* 1179–1181.
      Stallions, Increasing Number of, proposed, *July 6,* 1179.
    Census of all Available Horses in Great Britain and Ireland, proposed, *July 6,* 1176, 1182, 1183, 1188.
    Three-year-olds, Purchase of, proposed, *July 6,* 1185, 1186.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. [Dublin University]
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 29,* 420–422; *June 30,* 600, 627, 678; *July 1,* 837, 860.

Castlefrench Estate.
  Cattle-drive on 16th inst.
    Q. Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2,* 977.

Castlereagh, Lord [Maidstone]
  Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R. *July 6,* 1286.

Castleventry
Case of Representatives of P. Donovan.
Q. Mr. E. Barry; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 376.

Cattle
Import Statistics
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 25*, 60.
Shortage in Supply.
Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 25*, 59.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 241, 243.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 451, 482; *June 30*, 640; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1534.

Cawley, Sir F. [Lancashire, Prestwich]
Road Maintenance Necessitated by Heavy Motor Traffic, *July 7*, 1466.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con. July 3*, 1131.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 238, 252, 269, 270, 275, 276.
Meat Supply—Inquiry proposed, *June 30*, 583; *July 8*, 1680.
Naval Casualties Return, Continuance of, *June 25*, 76.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 382, 448–450, 469; *June 30*, 613, 615, 620, 627, 628, 656; *July 1*, 818, 826, 827, 834, 838, 843, 846–850, 869; *July 6*, 1352–1354, 1363–1367; *July 7*, 1513–1515, 1526, 1546, 1551, 1554, 1563–1567, 1571, 1574; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1380 1405.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1121.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour Employment Statistics, *June 29*, 352.

Census of Production Act
Rules Presented, *July 1*, 739; *July 2*, 902.

Ceylon
Public Works—Employment of Natives.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Colonel Seely, *June 25*, 81.

Chairman and Deputy-Chairman—Rulings
Civil Service Estimates
Education — Withdrawal of Irish Supplementary Vote, proposed, *July 2*, 1069.
Matter Relevant to Certain Votes, *June 25*, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 127, 128, 158, 180, 182.
Fisheries, Scotland—Opportunity for Discussion, *June 25*, 122, 126.

Chairman and Deputy-Chairman—Rulings—*cont.*
Navy Estimates—Irrelevant Matter, *July 8*, 1695.
Old-age Pensions Bill
Amendment to an Amendment, Discussion of together, 642, 643, 650.
Amendments out of Order, *July 1*, 780, 781.
Clauses 8 and 9, Voting Separately on, *July 1*, 874.
Cost of Various Amendments, *June 30*, 616, 649, 650.
Decision of the House could not be Questioned, *June 30*, 617.
Division—Doors in "No" Lobby Locked while Members were still entering "Aye" Lobby—Validity of Division, *June 30*, 698, 699.
Government Amendments of which Notice had not been given, Propriety of Closuring, *June 30*, 697, 698.
Irrelevant Matter, *June 29*, 430; *July 6*, 1403.
Remarks must be Confined to the Amendment before the Committee, *June 29*, 457, 464, 676, 686.
Report Stage, Amendments Permissible on, *June 29*, 468.
Separation of Certain Words in putting an Amendment, Possibility of, *June 29*, 482.
Whole of a Subsection could not be Discussed on an Amendment, *June 29*, 421, 422.
Teller receiving Bows of Members without removing his own Hat, *July 1*, 893.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A. [Worcestershire, E.]
Bank—Unclaimed Balances, Practice in Classing Accounts as Unclaimed, *June 29*, 358.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 390–393, 399, 467, 470, 472, 476, 482; *June 30*, 592, 594, 597, 598, 602, 611, 616, 620–622, 646–648, 650, 655, 663, 671–673, 676–678, 679; *July 1*, 806, 820, 821, 835, 850–852, 866, 868; *July 6*, 1357; *July 7*, 1497, 1517–1519, 1529, 1551, 1558, 1562, 1569, 1576; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1383–1386, 1395.
Clauses 8 and 9, Voting Separately on, *July 1*, 874.
Division—Doors in "No" Lobby Locked while Members were still entering "Aye" Lobby. Validity of Division, *June 30*, 698.
Government Amendments of which Notice had not been given, Propriety of Closuring, *June 30*, 697, 698.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Rt. Hon. Viscount Fowler.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.

Chancery Court
Ireland. Valuables Lodged in.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 7*, 1474.

Channel Islands
Shipping Laws
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *June 29*, 360.

Channing, Sir F. A. [Northants, E.]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 29*, 395, 418–420.
Poor Law Royal Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *July 6*, 1260.
Unemployment, Proposals for dealing with, *July 6*, 1250.

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. H. [Surrey, Wimbledon]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 30*, 617, 637–660, 643; *Recom., July 6*, 1397–1399.

Charities
[*See Names of Counties, etc.*]
Weir Charity, Administration of.
Qs. Sir H. Kimber; *As.* Mr. Trevelyan, *June 30*, 583.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Liverpool, Exchange]
Ballinclare — Case of A. Carton, *July 2*, 943.
Ballyvackey Farm — Case of P. Hayes, *July 1*, 771.
Bustard Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 1*, 772.
Cattle-driving
  Cases in 1908, *July 8*, 1669, 1670.
  Effect of System of Dealing with Offenders, *July 1*, 773, 774.
Chancery Court, Valuables Lodged with, *July 7*, 1474.
Clare, State of, *July 8*, 1671, 1672.
Congested Districts Board, Expenditure on Wages, *July 6*, 1213.
Croughteeri — Murphy Case, *July 8*, 1675, 1676.
Development Grant — Revised Estimate, *July 8*, 1667.
Dundrum Estate Cattle-drive, Persons Participating in, *July 1*, 775.

Education
  Fuel, etc., for Schools in 1907–1908, *July 8*, 1668.
  Grant, Additional, Allocation of, *July 6*, 1214.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*cont.*
Fermoy Courthouse, Use of, *July 8*, 1672, 1673.
Galway Poor Rate Collector's Poundage Fees, *July 8*, 1669.
Kerry—Evicted Tenants Reinstated, *July 6*, 1214.
Kiltoghert Cattle-drive — Threat of Looting Cattle, etc., *July 1*, 772, 773.
Kilmurray Meeting, Police Presence at, *July 6*, 1213.
Land Purchase Annuities, Arrears of, *July 8*, 1638, 1666.
Law Court Funds, Investment of, *July 7*, 1473.
Leitrim, State of, *July 8*, 1674.
Longford, State of, *July 8*, 1674, 1675.
Moate Cattle-drive, Cruelties perpetrated, during, *July 1*, 774.
Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, *Con., June 26*, 291.
Robe River Drainage, *July 6*, 1213.
Tredennick Estate Evicted Tenants, *July 6*, 1212.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

Children Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee B., *July 2*, 987.

China
Trade Reports presented, *June 25*, 3; *June 29*, 295.

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L. S.—*President of Board of Trade* [Dundee]
Bankruptcy — Case of G. H. Taylor, *July 1*, 762.
Belgium
  Antwerp — Shipping Fee System, *June 29*, 324.
  Cost of Living in, *July 6*, 1249.
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1325–1334.
Companies (Consolidation) Bill, Effect on Existing Law, *July 1*, 763.
Daylight Saving Bill, Report on, *July 6*, 1248.
Germany
  Report on Cost of Living in
    Cost of, *July 6*, 1249.
    Price of Bread, *July 1*, 764, 765; *July 6*, 1247, 1249, 1250.
  Savings Bank Deposits, *July 6*, 1248.
Irish Trade Commissioner for Certain Colonies, *July 7*, 1476.
Irish Trade Statistics, *July 6*, 1218.
Malt Importation (1903–7), *July 3*, 1086.

[*cont.*

Churchill, Rt. Hon. W. L. S.—*cont.*
Merchant Seamen, Discharged—Accommodation on Passage Home, *June 25*, 53.
Patents and Designs Act, 1907, Section 27. Representations in Respect of, *July 2*, 965; *July 1*, 763, 764.
Provincial Homes Investment Company, Limited, Operations of, *July 1*, 746.
Railways
  Bicycles, Conveyance of, *July 6*, 1248.
  Conference, Position as to, *June 29*, 362.
"Stowford," s.s., Crew of, *July 7*, 1443.
Strangford Bar, Whistling Buoy for, *July 2*, 984.
Tea Imports in 1907–8, *July 7*, 1446.
Thames Conservancy, Powers and Position of, *July 1*, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762; *July 7*, 1466.
Trade Mark as Evidence of Origin, Acceptance of, *June 30*, 571.
Tramways
  Accidents, Prevention of, *July 6*, 1218.
  Speedometers, Use of, *July 1*, 765.

Cider
Proof Spirit in.
  Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 25*, 64.

Cirencester
Royal Agricultural Students, Medals worn by.
  Qs. Mr. Rees, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 25*, 76.

Civil List Pensions
List Presented, *June 25*, 3, 51.
Persons in Receipt of, Return as to—Order (18th June) Discharged and Order substituted, *July 2*, 933.

Civil Service
Assistant Clerks (New Class), Employment of.
  Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 29*, 332.
Boy Clerks.
  Q. Mr. P. W. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 6*, 1255.
Superannuation, *see that title.*
Territorial Force Training Facilities.
  Q. Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 29*, 329.
  Q. Mr. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 2*, 974.
  Qs. Mr. Gibbs, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 6*, 1235.

Civil Service Estimates
Irish Education—£670,818, *Com.* July 2*, 1080.
  (Supplementary)—£114,000, *Com., July 2*, 988.
Scotland
  Fishery Board—£14,998, *Com.* July 8*, 1744.
  Secretary of State for, Salaries and Expenses—£11,600, *Com., June 25*, 116.

Clare
State of.
  Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. J. Campbell, Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. C. Craig, *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 8*, 1670.

Claremount Estate
Disposal of.
  Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 1222.

Cleland, Mr. J. W. [Glasgow, Bridgeton.]
Glasgow Unemployed—Opportunity for Discussion, *July 8*, 1783.
Police, Metropolitan — Good-conduct Stripes, *June 29*, 360.
Speeches, Duration of, *June 29*, 379.

Clonbrock, Lord
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 13; *Com. July 8*, 1603, 1609.

Cloncurry Estate
Situation on.
  Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 978.

Clough, Mr. W.—[Yorkshire W.R., Skipton]
Small Holdings Act, 1906
  Application of, *July 7*, 1471.
  Fruit Trees, Supply of, *July 7*, 1471.
  Market Gardeners' Compensation Act, Application of, *July 7*, 1471.

Clouncon
Case of J. Kenny.
  Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 8*, 1649.

Clynes, Mr. J. R.—[Manchester, N.E.]
Half-Timers — Proposals for Inquiry, *July 7*, 1470.
Income-Tax Assessment of Betting Profits, *July 7*, 1464.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill
Ballot, Date of Taking, by Miners' Federation.
  Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 2*, 964.
Date of Taking.
  Q. Sir J. Jacoby; *A.* Mr. Asquith *June 29*, 380.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) No. 2 Bill
c. 2R. *July 6*, 1261.

Coastguard
Fife Service, Decision as to.
Q. Major Anstruther - Gray; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 8*, 1650.

Manœuvres

Men required for.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 1*, 748.

Summer Manœuvres, Employment in.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *June 29*, 342.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H.—[Ayrshire, N.]
Navy — Casualties Return, Continuance of, *June 25*, 75.

Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 223–225.

Vatersay and Barra

Condition of Affairs in — Dispute between Lady Cathcart and Cottars, etc., *June 25*, 162, 194–202.

Trespass Act of 1865, Application of, *June 25*, 194.

Western Highlands of Scotland, Imprisonment in Technical Education, proposed, *June 25*, 195, 196.

Collieries
Explosions — Reports Presented, *July 8*, 1594, 1631.

Collings, Rt. Hon. J.—[Birmingham, Bordesley]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 428–430; *June 30*, 645, 690; *July 1*, 839.

Small Holdings and Allotments Act
Co-operative Societies' Profits, *July 2*, 972.

Demand for Small Holdings, Method of Ascertaining, *July 2*, 970.

Expenses, Payment of, *June 30*, 578; *July 2*, 970, 971.

Collins, Sir W. J.—[St. Pancras, W.]
Channel Islands, Shipping Laws, *June 29*, 360.

London University, Position of, *June 29*, 365.

Reformatory School Records, *July 8*, 1637.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Crewe.

Under-Secretary—Colonel Seely.

Colonies and Protectorates
[*For Particular Colonies, etc., see their Names.*]

Annual Report Presented, *July 1*, 730, 738; *July 7*, 1418, 1442.

Loans, Return as to.
Q. Viscount Helmsley; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 2*, 935.

Commercial Union Assurance Company Bill
c. 2R.* *June 29*, 321.
*Rep.** *July 7*, 1439.

Commons
Towyn Trewan, Anglesey—Report from Select Committee Presented, *July 7*, 1481.

Commons Bill
l. 2R., *July 2*, 928.

Companies Bill
c. 1R.* *June 25*, 116.

Companies (Consolidation) Bill
Effect on Existing Law.
Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 1*, 762.

Joint Committee, *June 25*, 214; *June 29*, 294; *July 1*, 731, 738; *July 2*, 987; *July 6*, 1148.

Congested Districts Board (Ireland)
Wages, Expenditure on
Q. Mr. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 6*. 1213.

Works, Cause for Stoppage of.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 984.
Qs. Mr. Dillon, Capt. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 7*, 1474.

Congo Free State
Native Trading Rights.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *June 25*, 82.

Protestant Mission Sites.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 955.

Constabulary, Royal Irish [*See also Names of Places.*]

Coonana
Pier, Lighting of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 23*, 55.

Cooper, Mr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Cab, Taximeter—Seating Accommodation, *July 8*, 1633.

Cattle, Import Statistics, *June 25*, 60.

Franco-British Exhibition—Cab Fares, *July 8*, 1633.

[*cont.*

Cooper, Mr. G.—*cont.*
- Meat
  - Beef, Cause for Shortage in, *June 25*, 60.
  - Railway Charges for Conveyance of, *June 25*, 90.
- Police Admission to Brighton Convalescent Home, *July 8*, 1632.

Cork
- Corporation Surcharges
  - *Qs.* Mr. W. O'Brien, Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *June 30*, 587.

Cornwall, Duchy of
- *Lord Warden*—Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

Coroners
- South-Western District Coroner, Allegations against.
  - *Q.* Major Renton; *A.* Sir W. Robson, *July 6*, 1257.

Coroners' Inquests Bill
- *c. Con.* July 3*, 1144.

Coroners' (Ireland) Bill
- *c.* Report from Standing Committee A, *July 6*, 1260.
- *Con.* and 3R.* *July 7*, 1592.
- *l.* 1R.* *July 8*, 1595.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
- India—Case of Ramchandra Naryen Mendlik, *June 29*, 350.

Courthope, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]
- Agricultural Holding Act Consolidation Bill, Date of Introducing, *June 26*, 221.
- Canadian Militia, Ross Rifle for, *July 6*, 1214.
- Small Holdings Acts Consolidation Bill, Date of Introducing, *June 26*, 221.

Courtney, Lord
- India
- Administrative Policy, *June 3*, 548.
  - Bengal, Partition of, Unrest due to, Alleged, *June 30*, 549.
  - Education System, Evils of, *June 30*, 548, 549.

Cowan, Mr. W. H. [Surrey, Guildford]
- Telegraph, Reply-paid Unused Forms, *July 2*, 942.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
- Education Grant, Additional, Distribution of, *June 29*, 378.
- National Military Training (No. 2) Bill, Intro., *July 7*, 1484–1486.
- Northumberland School Site—Westerhope and North Warbottle, *July 2*, 967.
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 622; *July 1*, 825, 827; *July 7*, 1507–1510.

Cox, Mr. H.—*cont.*
- Rhodesia, Asiatic Registration Act, *June 29*, 353.
- Transvaal Gold Law—Reply received, *July 6*, 1236.
- Unemployed, Grant for, *June 29*, 359.

Craig, Capt. J. [Down, E.]
- Autumn Session, Proposals as to, *July 2*, 984; *July 7*, 1479.
- Ballymahon Unlawful Assembly Case—Signing of Summonses, *June 25*, 99.
- Belfast—Hibernian Excursion, Stone thrown at, *June 25*, 108.
- Castlefrench Estate Cattle-drive on 16th inst., *July 2*, 977.
- Cattle-drives, Attitude of the Government, *June 25*, 101.
- Condition of Ireland—Government Attitude, *June 30*, 584, 585, 586.
- Congested Districts Board Works, Stoppage of, *July 7*, 1476.
- Dundrum Estate, Situation on, *June 25*, 100.
- Education Grant, Additional, Distribution of, *July 2*, 975.
- Galway, Condition of, *June 25*, 100.
- Irish Rifles, Royal—Strength, Number Joining Special Reserve, etc., *July 2*, 947.
- Irish Universities Bill
  - Proposals as to, *June 30*, 586, 588.
  - Vatican Opinion of, *June 30*, 568.
- Leitrim—Case of P. Lyons, *June 25*, 98, 99.
- Militia, Disbanded Units—Disposal of Officers, *June 26*, 221.
- Monaghan Estate, Disposal of Untenanted Land, *June 25*, 102.
- Motor Speed Limit in London, *July 7*, 1468.
- Nolan Estate Cattle-drives, *June 25*, 98.
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 625, 664–666, 675, 685, 686.
- Outrages Reported in May, *June 25*, 99, 100.
- Poor Law, Irish Reform Proposals, *July 2*, 982.
- Proclamation of Irish Counties, Effect of, *June 25*, 101.
- Queen's Colleges—*Status* of Professors, *July 2*, 983.
- Rockfield—Case of J. Burke, *June 25*, 103.
- Russia—Case of Mr. Luxenburg, *July 2*, 953.
- Strangford Bar, Whistling Buoy for *July 2*, 984.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
Cattle-driving Cases in 1908, *July 8*, 1670.
Clare, State of, *July 8*, 1672.
Education Grant, Additional, Allocation of, *July 3*, 1089.
Longford, State of, *July 8*, 1674, 1675.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 167–171.
Western Highlands of Scotland, Improvement in Technical Education, proposed, *June 25*, 174, 175.

Crete
Trade Reports Presented, *July 1*, 730.

Crewe, Earl of—*Secretary of State for the Colonies.*
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 4, 16–18; *July 8*, 1599–1601, 1605, 1606, 1610.
Land Purchase, Ireland, Evidence taken before Departmental Committee, *July 2*, 930.
Land Values (Scotland) Bill, *Rep.*, *July 3*, 920–923.
Merchant Shipping — Board of Trade Inquiry in Cases of Missing Ships, proposed, *July 6*, 1160–1162.
Nurses Registration Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1198–1201.
Proclaimed Counties, Extra Expenditure involved by Disturbances, *July 7*, 1438.
Taxation, Local, Increased Burdens thrown on Rates, etc., *June 25*, 44–47.

Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill
l. 2R., *June 25*, 18.
Com. and *Rep*,* *June 29*, 320.
3R.* *June 30*, 496.

Criminal Procedure
Borstal System — Extension to Females.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 2*, 963.
Re-Trial, Delays in Cases of.
Os. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *June 29*, 315; Lord Loreburn, 316–318; Lord Alverstone, 318–320.
Simpson, Robert, Sentence on.
Os. Mr. Morton, *June 25*, 182.

Cromer, Earl
India
Administrative Policy, *June 30*, 535
Education System, Evils of, *June 30*, 534.
Fuller, Sir Bampfylde—Circumstances of Resignation, *June 30*, 633.
Seditious Writings and Meetings, Effect of, *June 30*, 536–538.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 1*, 865, 866; *July 7*, 1556–1558.

Croughteeri
Case of J. Murphy.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 341.
Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 8*, 1675.

Croydon and Southern District Tramways Bill
l. Bill not to be proceeded with, *June 30*, 493.

Crumlin
Post Office Charge Clerk.
Q. Mr. Moore; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6*, 1209.

Crystal Palace Company Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 2*, 901.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]
Galway Poor Rate Collectors' Poundage Fees, *July 8*, 1669.

Curran, Mr. P. [Durham, Jarrow]
Local Authorities (Administration of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 240.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 6*, 1350 1351.

Curzon of Kedleston, Lord
Afghanistan
Anglo-Russian Agreement — Attitude of Ameer, *June 30*, 503, 504, 554.
British Policy in, *June 30*, 502–504.
Papers relating to—Tabling, proposed, *June 30*, 504, 555, 556.
India
Bengal, Unrest due to Partition, alleged, *June 30*, 510–513, 554, 555.
Condition of—Causes of Unrest, etc., *June 30*, 498–500, 505–520.
Educational System, Evils of, *June 30*, 506.
Frontier Disturbances, Causes of, etc., *June 30*, 500–502.
Fuller, Sir Bampfylde—Circumstances of Resignation, *June 30*, 514, 515.
Press Act, Terms of, *June 30*, 517, 518.
Seditious Writings and Meetings, Effect of, *June 30*, 505, 509, 516.

Customs and Excise
New Scheme for Excise, Effect of.
Qs. Mr. Sears; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 25*, 63.

D'Angely Case
- Charges Against Police, Apology for.
  - *Qs.* Mr. A. Dewar, Mr. MacNeill; *As* Mr. Gladstone, *July 6*, 1245.
- Press Attacks on Police, Payment of, Cost of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Rendall; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 8*, 1656.

"Daily Mail"
- Reply-Paid Telegrams Sent to Members.
  - *O.* Mr. J. MacVeagh, *July 8*, 1657.

Dairies
- Ireland—Protests Against Order.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Barrie, Mr. H. Law; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 3*, 1088.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
- Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 245, 257.

Davies, Mr. E. W. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 598, 599; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1495, 1498.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]
- Patents Act, 1907—Section 27, working of, *July 1*, 763.

Daylight Saving Bill.
- *c. Rep.* June 30*, 590.
  - *Com.* July 3*, 1144.
- Facilities for.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 8*, 1682.
- Report on.
  - *Q.* Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 6*, 1248.

Delmege Estate
- Sale Proposals.
  - *Q* .Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 110.

Denman, Lord
- Land Purchase, Ireland
  - Evidence Taken before Departmental Committee—Tabling, proposed, *July 2*, 929.
  - Fund, Claims upon and Payments out of to 31st May, 1908, *June 25*, 23.
- Galway Extra Police, Charge for, *July 7*, 1429, 1431.
- Proclaimed Counties
  - Constabulary Force in—Return as to Cost, Strength, etc., proposed, *July 7*, 1432.
  - Extra Expenditure Involved by Disturbances, Method of Allocating, *July 7*, 1429–1431.

Destructive Insects and Pests Acts
- Order (1908), Presented, *June 29*, 323; *June 30*, 494.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Belfast, W.]
- Australian Harvester Excise Act, *July 6*, 1215.
- Belfast
  - Hibernian Excursion, Stone Thrown at, *June 25*, 108.
  - Licensed Houses under Police Observation, *July 2*, 938.
  - Prison Officers, Hours of Duty of *June 29*, 337.
  - Tramway Accounts, *June 25*, 68.
  - Workhouses
    - Admissions, *July 2*, 939.
    - Report on, *July 2*, 980.
- Bureau of Commerce for Ireland, proposed, *July 8*, 1647.
- Consumption in Ireland, *July 8*, 1648.
- Education
  - Grant, Additional, Distribution of *July 2*, 976.
  - Intermediate Grant, *July 6*, 1222.
- National School Teachers' Civil Rights, *July 8*, 1648.
- Goraghwood Excursion Train—Cause for Stoppage in Tunnel, *June 25*, 107.
- Greencastle—Police Visits to Public-houses, *June 29*, 336.
- Irish Trade Statistics, *July 6*, 1218.
- Maghera Constabulary Transfers, *July 2*, 937.
- Parliamentary Reform—Legislative Proposals, *July 2*, 985.
- Paupers, Irish—Deportation System, *July 2*, 980, 981.
- Telegraph Boy Messengers, Discharge of, *June 25*, 113.

Dewar, Mr. A. [Edinburgh, S.]
- D'Angely Case, *July 6*, 1245–1247.
- Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 138–148, 151, 201.

Dewar, Sir J. A. [Inverness]
- Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 152, 171–174.

Dickinson, Mr. W. H. [St. Pancras, N.]
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 470, 472; *July 1*, 857–859.
- Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1091-1094.

Dickson Estate
- Mulcair Lands, Disposal of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 977.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wiltshire, Chippenham]
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 1*, 803–806.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
Africa, South—Cost of Middelburg Farm, etc., *June 29*, 344.
Congo Free State—Native Trading Rights, *June 25*, 82.
Hague Conference Final Act, Signing of, *June 30*, 566.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 430, 464; *July 1*, 809–811; *July 6*, 1381.
Thames Conservancy, Powers and Position of, *July 1*, 761.
Transvaal Native Land and Tax Bills, *July 6*, 1237.
Tunstall — Woodland Pottery Lead-poisoning Cases, *July 2*, 963.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
Congested Districts Board Works, Cause for Stoppage of, *July 2*, 984; *July 7*, 1474, 1476.
Development Grant—Revised Estimate, *July 8*, 1667.
National School Teachers' Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2*, 1051–1059.
Persia
Condition of, *June 30*, 569.
Papers, Tabling of, *July 7*, 1460.
Teheran—Troops at British Legation, *July 2*, 957; *July 7*, 1460.
Russia—Matters discussed during King's Visit, *July 2*, 958.

Dividing Societies
Valuation System.
Qs. Viscount Morpeth; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 7*, 1472.

Dockyards, Naval
See under Navy.

Doncaster Corporation Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 2*, 901.
3R.* *July 8*, 1593.

Donelan, Captain A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
Fermoy Courthouse, Use of, *July 8*, 1673.

Donoughmore, Earl of
Army Horses
Number Required, *July 6*, 1164.
Supply of—Tabling Papers, proposed, *July 6*, 1163, 1169.
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 8*, 1601–1603.
Horse Breeding
Government Action, Necessity for, *July 6*, 1163–1169, 1188.
Mares, Possibility of Checking Export of, *July 6*, 1166.
Stallions, Increasing Number of, proposed, *July 6*, 1166.

Donoughmore, Earl of—*cont.*
Land Purchase Funds
Claims upon and Payments out of to 31st May, 1908, *June 25*, 23, 24.
Delay in Provision and Distribution of, *June 30*, 495.

Dorchester
Small Holdings Inquiries.
Qs. Mr. Morrell, Viscount Valentia; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 30*, 577.

Doughty, Sir G. [Great Grimsby]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1285.

Du Cros, Mr. A. [Hastings]
South-Western Suburban Water Bill, 3R., *June 30*, 725–728.

Duncan Mr. C. [Barrow-in-Furness]
Naval Mechanicians — New Training Scheme, *July 8*, 1712–1716, 1721.

Duncan, Mr. R. [Lanark, Govan]
National School Teachers' Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2*, 1049.
Naval Mechanicians — New Training Scheme, *July 8*, 1739, 1740.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 451, 458; *July 6*, 1355.

Dundee
Postal Staff—Cost of Living.
Q. Mr. Wilkie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 2*, 933.

Dundrum Estate
Cattle-Drive, Persons Participating in.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 1*, 775.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 100.

Dunfanaghy
Labourers Act Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 26*, 221.

Education, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. W. Runciman.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. T. McK. Wood.

Education (England and Wales)
[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]
Blind and Defective, etc., Children—Regulations (1908) Presented, *June 30*, 494, 559.
Code Presented, *July 2*, 902, 932.
Date of Circulating.
Q. Mr. G. Gooch; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *June 29*, 366.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales)—*cont.*
Conference at Manchester.
Q. Mr. F. E. Smith; *A.* Mr. McK. Wood, *June 25*, 61.
Cost, Increase in.
Os. Lord Belper, *June 25*, 30–33.
Medical Inspection of Children, Grants for.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 2*, 967.
Qs. Mr. H. J. Tennant, Mr. H. Gooch; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 6*, 1251.
Secondary School Grants (1907–8).
Qs. Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *June 30*, 576.
Secondary and Technical—Regulations for Training of Teachers, Presented, *July 8*, 1631.
Teachers
Preliminary Examination Results, Delay in Issuing.
Q. Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 8*, 1641.
Registration Council—Scheme Presented, *July 8*, 1632.
Training Colleges
Admission Regulations.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *June 29*, 324.
Secondary, Position of.
Q. Mr. Rawlinson; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *June 29*, 326.
Training of Teachers—Regulations Presented, *July 1*, 740; *July 2*, 902.
Training of Teachers
Domestic Subjects—Regulations Presented, *July 7*, 1442; *July 8*, 1594.
Waivers—Applications received in 1907–8.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 2*, 942.

Education (Ireland)
[*For Particular Places, see their Names.*]
Agriculture, Instruction in, proposed.
Os. Mr. Power, *July 2*, 1027.
Amalgamation Proposals.
Os. Mr. J. Campbell, *July 2*, 1016; Mr. Power, 1025, 1028; Mr. Butcher, 1029, 1030; Mr. Sheehy, 1050; Mr. Birrell, 1063.
Qs. Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 8*, 1647.
Attendance under Thirty-five, Cases of.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 326.
Bi-lingual Programme.
Os. Mr. Hazleton, *July 2*, 990.
Christian Brothers' Schools, Pupils in and Grants to.
Os. Mr. Murnaghan, *July 2*, 1039–1042; Mr. Birrell, 1071, 1072.
Commission, Constitution of.
Os. Mr. J. Murphy, *July 2*, 1000, 1001; Mr. W. Long, 1003.

Education (Ireland)—*cont.*
Fuel, Upkeep and Repairs—Expenditure in 1907–8.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 8*, 1668.
Grant, Additional, Distribution of.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 26*, 220.
Qs. Mr. J. Murphy, Mr. Cox; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 29*, 377.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. Devlin, Mr. J. Murphy, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 975.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 3*, 1089.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 6*, 1214.
Higher Education, Assistance to.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 6*, 1219.
Intermediate
Grant.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 1222.
Inspectorate.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 102.
Rules.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 67.
King's Scholarship Examination, Females Passing.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 982.
MacMillan, Mr., Reports of.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 338.
National School Teachers
Civil Rights of.
Os. Mr. Moore, *July 2*, 1036, 1037; Mr. Birrell, 1037.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 8*, 1648.
Dismissals, Regulations as to.
Os. Mr. Sloan, *July 2*, 1043, 1044, 1073; Mr. Harrington, 1046, 1047; Mr. Birrell, 1073.
Grievances of.
Os. Mr. Hazleton, *July 2*, 990.
Liquor Licences, Regulations as to Teachers having Connection with.
Os. Mr. J. Murphy, *July 2*, 1001; Mr. Harrington, 1046; Mr. Birrell, 1074.
Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting.
Os. Mr. Hazleton, *July 2*, 991–994; Mr. J. Murphy, 996–999; Mr. Birrell, 997, 1060–1069; Mr. W. Long, 1003–1006; Mr. W. Redmond, 1008–1012; Mr. J. Campbell, 1014–1018; Mr. John O'Connor, 1018–1024; Mr. Barrie, 1024; Mr. Power, 1025; Mr. Butcher, 1028; Mr. T. M. Healy,

[*cont.*

Education (Ireland)—*cont.*
National School Teachers—*cont.*
Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting—*cont.*
1031–1035; Mr. Moore, 1035–1038; Mr. Sloan, 1042, 1045; Mr. Lardner, 1047–1049; Mr. R. Duncan, 1049; Mr. Sheehy, 1050; Mr. Dillon, 1051–1059; Mr. W. Long, 1074–1076; Mr. Hobhouse, 1076; Mr. T. M. Healy, 1077, 1078; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1078; Mr. O'Dowd, 1079.
Transition Teachers, Grievances of.
Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 67.
University Lecture Courses.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 1222.
Primary, Condition of.
Os. Mr. Hazleton, *July 2*, 989; Mr. Murphy, 999–1003; Mr. Byles, 1078, 1079.
Scholarships, etc., Grants for.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 1221.
School, Roll No. 1950, Circuit 9, Section A., Teaching in.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 3*, 1086.
Schools—Sanitary Condition and Heating Arrangements.
Os. Mr. J. Murphy, *July 2*, 1001; Mr. W. Redmond, 1012, 1013; Mr. Power, 1026; Mr. Birrell, 1070, 1071.
Training—Applications for One Year's Course.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 340.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill
l. Rep. June 30*, 493.
Com. July 1*, 730.
Rep. July 2*, 901.
3R.* *July 6*, 1147.
c. 1R.* *July 7*, 1440.
l. Report from Select Committee (No. 1), *June 30*, 493.

Education (Local Authorities) Bill
c. Con., July 3, 1126.

Education of the Blind Bill
c. 1R.* *June 29*, 381.

Education (Scotland) Bill
Clause 9 (1), Effect of Amending.
Q. Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 29*, 372.

Egypt
Administrators Absent on Leave.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1459.
Cairo Drainage Scheme.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1459.

Egypt—*cont.*
Cattle Plague.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1461.
Khedive—Visit to England.
Qs. Mr. Kettle; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *June 25*, 85.
Liquor Traffic—Compensation on Closing Establishments.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1462.
Mohammed Elal, Case of.
Qs. Mr. Kettle; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *June 25*, 86.
Newspaper Statements as to Soudan Disturbance.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1459.
Special Tribunal Decree.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *June 30*, 567.
University, Proposals for.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1462.

Electric Lighting Acts
Report of Board of Trade Presented, *June 25*, 4, 51.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
l. Rep. June 25*, 3.
3R.* *June 29*, 294.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 1*, 737.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. Rep. June 25*, 3.
3R.* *June 29*, 294.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 1*, 737.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
l. Rep. June 25*, 3.
3R.* *June 29*, 294.
c. 1R.* *June 29*, 322.

Ellenborough, Lord
"Bengor Head," s.s., Causes of Accidents to, in Portsmouth Harbour, *July 1*, 734.
"Grindon Hall," s.s., Preliminary Inquiry into Loss of, *July 6*, 1157.
Merchant Shipping—Foreign Systems of Pensions, Medical Aid, etc., *June 29*, 309.

Embo
Pier Improvement.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 1*, 769.

Endowed School [Masters] Bill
c. 1R.* *July 1*, 731.
2R.* *July 7*, 1419.

Ennis
County Court—Compensation Awarded for Malicious Injuries to Cattle.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 109.

Erith
Unemployed Grant.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell, Mr. Rowlands; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 7*, 1468.

Erroll, Earl of
Horses
Army—Number required, *July 6*, 1173, 1174.
Breeding—Necessity for Government Action, *July 6*, 1172–1176.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
Ballinclare—Case of A. Carton, *July 2*, 943.

Evans, Sir S. T.—*Solicitor-General* [Glamorganshire, Mid.]
Incest Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 288.
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1105.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *Jun 30*, 678.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act
Working of.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 30*, 560.

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill
l. 2R., *June 25*, 4.
Com., *July 8*, 1595.

Evictions, Ireland
See under Ireland.

Faber, Capt. W. V. [Hampshire, Andover]
Africa, South—Police Knowledge of Dutch, *July 7*, 1458.
Army Territorial Force Artillery Adjutants, *July 1*, 750.
Old Age Pensions—Provisions as to Naval and Military Service, *July 1*, 744, 754.
Regent Circus Flower Girls, *July 1*, 755.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]
Land Purchase stock, *July 8*, 1676.
Naval Volunteer Reserve, Supply of Kit to, *June 30*, 562.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 1*, 812; *July 7*, 1499–1501.

Factory and Workshops
Annual Report, Presented, *July 1*, 731, 739.
Brass-casting — Regulations, Presented, *June 29*, 295, 323.

Fairfield Shipbuilding Company
Prosecution of.
Q. Mr. J. M. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 6*, 1240.

Falkland Islands
Annual Report Presented, *July 1*, 730, 738.

Fardell, Sir T. G. [Paddington, S.]
Reask—Cattle-drive on 26th ult., *June 29*, 335.
Taumagh Farm—Cattle-drives in May and June, *June 29*, 335.

Farrell, Mr. J. [Longford, N.]
Army—Case of J. Gillen, *June 29*, 329.
Evictions — Reinstatement Applications, *June 29*, 339.
Granard—Case of Cuffe Children, *June 29*, 340.
Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Sale Proposals, *June 29*, 339.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
British Columbia—Coastal trading by United States Vessels, *June 29*, 353.
Coastguard, Employment in Summer Manœuvres, *June 29*, 342.
Germany, Report on Cost of Living in *July 6*, 1249.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 6*, 1359; *July 7*, 1489, 1525.
Clause 3 (*b*), Males likely to be Disqualified under, *June 29*, 359.
Transvaal
Boer Migration, *July 6*, 1236.
Native Labour in Mines—Mortality Statistics, *June 29*, 351.
Woolwich Arsenal
Case of J. Reynolds, *July 6*, 1229, 1230.
Discharges in 1908, *July 6*, 1228.

Ferens, Mr. T. R. [Hull, E.]
Hull Post Office—Split Duties, *July 6*, 1216.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to Enforcing Three-mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1777, 1778.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 1*, 840.

Fermoy
Courthouse, Use and Control of.
Qs. Mr. Abraham, Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 8*, 1672.

Ferro-Concrete
Coal Residues, Use of.
Q. Mr. Ridsdale; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 1*. 741.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
Gurteinminogue—Case of B. Radford, *June 30*, 561.
Land Purchase Transactions, *June 26*, 218.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick
Civil Service Assistant Clerks (New Class), Employment of, *June 29*, 332.

Finchley Urban District Council Bill
l. 3R*, *July 6*, 1145.

Fine Art and General Insurance Company Bill
l. Bill not to be proceeded with, *June 30*, 494.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.

Fisheries
See also Names of Places, Rivers, etc.
Convention with United States, Presented, *July 1*, 730, 739.
Irish
Cruisers for Protection of.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 25*, 57.
Grant from Department.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 25*, 56.
Scottish
Board—Fees and Expenses.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 3*, 1084.
Cruiser.
Qs. Mr. Weir, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *June* 25, 96.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 2*, 974.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1665.
Gratuities to Fishermen for Assistance in Detecting Illegal Trawling, Proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 25*, 96.
Nets—Inquiry into Size Used, proposed.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, *July* 8, 1752, 1753.
Opportunity for Discussion.
Qs. Mr. Pirie, *June 25*, 121, 123, 126; Mr. Morton, 122; Mr. Chairman, 122, 126.
Public Rights in Rivers.
Q. Mr. Menzies; *A.* Mr. Shaw, *July 1*, 770.
Size of Fishing-Boats, Increase in.
Qs. Mr. Williamson, *July 8*, 1750
Steam-Trawlers, Number of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 25*, 95.
Sea Fisheries Committees, Grant to.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 30*, 582.

Fisheries—*cont.*
Trawling
Legislative Proposals.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 25*, 96.
Penalties on Foreign Trawlers.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 25*, 97.

Fitzmaurice, Lord—*Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs.*
Merchant Shipping — Foreign Systems of Pensions, Medical Aid, etc., *June 29*, 314.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
Kerry—Evicted Tenants Reinstated, *July 6*, 1214.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork N.]
Bank Notes, Irish, Commission Charged on, *June 30*, 588, 589; *July 6*, 1258, 1259.
Butter and Margarine Act in Scotland, *July 7*, 1477.
Education
Grant, Additional, Distribution of, *July 2*, 976.
Intermediate Inspectorate, *June 25*, 102, 103.
Hyde Park Carriage Entrances, *July 6*, 1255.
Kilbrin—Case of J. Nash, *July 2*, 935.
Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887, Repeal of Section 7, proposed, *June 25*, 106, 107.
Milk Skimmed, Condensed — Export from Certain Countries, *June 25*, 92, 93.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 7*, 1519.

Foiladown
Case of J. Healy.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell *June 29*, 376.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
Under-Secretary—Lord Fitzmaurice.
Vote, Date of taking.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 1*, 775.

Forestry
Irish—Case of Mr. Ellison.
Q. Mr. Muldoon; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 25*, 57.

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir W. [Derby, Ilkeston.]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 414–416; *July 1*, 796–800, 824, 826, 831.

Foynes
Telegraphic Address of O'Connor.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 8*, 1678.

France
Budget (1908) Presented, *June 30*, 494.
Tariff Commission.
Q. Mr. James Hope ; A. Mr. J. A. Pease, *July 6*, 1237.
Q. Earl of Ronaldshay ; A. Sir H Kearley, *July 8*, 1658.

Franchise Reform
See Parliamentary Reform *and* Women's Suffrage Movement.

Franco-British Exhibition
Cab Fares and Regulations.
Q. Mr. Cooper ; A. Mr. Gladstone, *July 8*, 1633.
Indian Subsidy and Exhibits.
Qs. Mr. O'Grady ; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 30*, 563, 564.

Friendly Societies
Reports (Part A) Presented, *July 6*, 1148, 1208.

Fullerton, Mr. H. [Cumberland, Egremont.]
Sheep Scab—Value of Salving, *June 25*, 69.

Galashiels Drainage and Burgh Extension Order Confirmation Bill
c. 1R.* *June 25*, 48.
2R.* *July 6*, 1205.
Con. July 8*, 1630.

Galway
Condition of.
Q. Capt. Craig ; A. Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 100.
Extra Police, Charge for.
Qs. Lord Killanin, *July 7*, 1424, 1427, 1428 ; Lord Denman, 1429, 1431.
Poor Rate Collector's Poundage Fees.
Q. Mr. Gwynn, Mr. Cullinan ; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 8*, 1668.

Garw and Ogmore Gas Bill
l. Rep. June 30*, 493.
3R.* *July 7*, 1418.

Gas Orders Confirmation Bill
l. Rep. June 21*, 293.
Com. July 1*, 730.
Rep. July 2*, 901.
3R.* *July 6*, 1147.
c. 1R.* *July 6*, 1207.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill
l. Rep. June 30*, 493.
Com. July 1*, 730.
Rep. July 2*, 901.
3R.* *July 6*, 1147.
c. 1R.* *July 6*, 1207.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (Sevenoaks and Stourbridge Water Orders) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *June 30*, 493.

Germany
Cost of Living, Report on.
Bread, Error as to Price of.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 1*, 764.
Qs. Mr. Goulding, Earl of Ronaldshay ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 6*, 1247.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Mr. Lyttelton ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 6*, 1249.
Cost, etc.
Q. Mr. Fell ; A. Mr. Churchill, *July 6*, 1249.
Savings Banks Deposits.
Q. Earl of Ronaldshay ; A. Mr. Churchill, *July 6*, 1248.

Gibbs, Mr. G. A. [Bristol, W.]
Army Special Reserve—Position of Sergeants-Major, *July 7*, 1457.
Civil Service—Territorial Force Camp-Training leave, *July 2*, 974 ; *July 6*, 1235.
Post Office Savings Bank Deposits (1903–1907), *July 7*, 1469.

Gibraltar
Annual Report Presented, *July 7*, 1418, 1442.

Gill, Mr. A. H. [Bolton.]
Bolton Post Office Telephonist, Case of, *June 25*, 69.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]
Land Purchase Transactions, *July 6*, 1219.
Smythe Estate—Case of Mrs. Riggs, *June 25*, 66.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]
Alderney *Chefs de Famille*, Petitions from, *July 8*, 1643.
British Medical Association—Statues on New Building, *June 29*, 325.
Cabs
Motor and Horse Cabs in London, *July 2*, 935.
Taximeter
Seating accommodation, *July 8*, 1633.
Speed of, *July 6*, 1244.
Channel Islands—Shipping Laws, *June 29*, 360.
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill—Date of taking Ballot by Miners' Federation, *July 2*, 965.
Criminal Procedure—Extension of Borstal System to Females, *July 2*, 963.
D'Angely Case—Charges against Police, *July 6*, 1246, 1247 ; *July 8*, 1656, 1657.
Fairfield Shipbuilding Company, Prosecution of, *July 6*, 1240.

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*
Franco-British Exhibition—Cab Fares, *July 8*, 1633.
Lights on Vehicles Act—Application to harvesting Vehicles, *July 6*, 1245.
Liquor Traffic—Dominoes, etc., in Public Houses, *June 29*, 361, 362.
Motors—Use of Speedometers, *July 1*, 756.
Omnibuses
  Motor-bus Accidents in April and May, *July 2*, 962.
  Number in London, *July 2*, 935.
  Speed in London, *July 1*, 756.
Police
  Annual Holiday, *July 1*, 755.
  Brighton Convalescent Home, Admission to, *July 8*, 1632.
  Constables raised from the Ranks, *July 2*, 963.
  Metropolitan
    Duty during Visit of French President, Pay for, *July 6*, 1240.
    Good-conduct Stripes, *June 29*, 360.
Population Statistics, *July 3*, 1082.
Reformatory and Industrial School Records, *July 8*, 1637.
Regent Circus Flower Girls, *July 1*, 755.
Sheffield Parks—Case of G. H. Fletcher, *June 25*, 61.
Statues in London, Police Report on, proposed, *June 29*, 326.
Street Traffic—Regulation of Routes of Vehicles, *July 1*, 756.
Swansea—King's Dock Fatality on 20th inst., *June 30*, 570.
Tunstall—Woodland Pottery Lead-poisoning Cases, *July 2*, 964.
Welsh Church
  Disestablishment—Legislative Proposals, *June 29*, 361.
  Commission Report, Date of Issuing, *June 29*, 360.
Westminster Church Army March on 4th April, Drunkenness observed during, *July 2*, 961, 962; *July 6*, 1241, 1242.
Women's Suffrage Movement
  Police employed on 30th ult., Cost of, etc., *July 2*, 961.
  Prison Treatment, *July 1*, 757; *July 2*, 959, 960; *July 6*, 1243, 1244.

Glanders
Rideal-Walker method of Disinfection.
  Q. Colonel Walker; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 3*, 1085.

Glasgow
High School for Girls—Pension of Rector.
  Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 26*, 219.
Territorial Force Ammunition, Cost of.
  Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 25*, 64.
Unemployed—Opportunity for Discussion.
  Os. Mr. Barnes, *July 8*, 1782; Mr. Cleland, Mr. Watt, Mr. C. E. Price, 1783; Mr. J. A. Pease, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, 1784.

Glenakill, South
Case of Mrs. J. Guiney
  Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 937.

Glover, Mr. T. [St. Helens]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1321

Gooch, Mr. G. P [Bath]
Education Code, Date of Circulating, *June 29*, 366.
Turkey—State of Salonika, *June 30*, 566.

Gooch, Mr. H. C. [Camberwell, Peckham]
Hyde Park Carriage Entrances, *July 6*, 1254.
Medical Inspection of Children, *July 6*. 1253.

Gooseberry Mildew
Irish Preventive Measures
  Q. Mr. Gwynn; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 8*, 1665.
Outbreaks
  Cause of.
    Q. Mr. L. Hardy; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 1*, 745.
  Number in 1908.
    Q. Mr. L. Hardy; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 25*, 68.

Goraghwood
Excursion Train—Cause for Stoppage in Tunnel.
  Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 107.

Gore-Booth Estate
Sale Proposals.
  Q. Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 7*, 1450.

Goulding, Mr. [Worcester]
Germany, Report on Cost of Living in, *July 6*, 1247.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *June 29*, 412–414, 423, 443–446, 458; *June 30*, 643, 648–650, 674; *July 6*, 1351.
Trade, Board of—Date of taking Vote, *July 6*, 1259, 1260.

Government Stock
  Unclaimed—Return proposed.
    Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 6*, 1238.

Granard
  Cuffe Children, Case of.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 340.

Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway Bill
  c. 2R., *June 29*, 321.

Greencastle
  Police Visits to Public-Houses
    Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 336.

Greenwich Hospital
  Pension Grievances.
    Os. Mr. Bramsdon, *July 8*, 1742, 1743; Mr. McKenna, 1743.

Greenwood, Mr. G. [Peterborough]
  St. Bride's School Children at Otter Hunt, *July 6*, 1253.

Grehan Estates
  Evicted Tenants.
    Q. Mr. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 3*, 1087.

Gretton, Mr. J. [Rutland]
  Coastguard Service—Men required for Manœuvres, *July 1*, 748.
  Hamble River Navigation, *July 7*, 1454.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 7*, 1533, 1570.
  Post Office — Substitutes during Camp Training, *June 25*, 93.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick].
  Arms Conference
    Date of Conclusion, etc., *July 2*, 956.
    Scope of, *July 8*, 1639.
  Canadian Tariff Convention with France—Tabling of Correspondence, *June 30*, 568.
  Congo Free State
    Native Trading Rights, *June 25*, 82.
    Protestant Mission Sites, *July 2*, 955.
  Egypt
    Administrators Absent on Leave, *July 7*, 1459.
    Cairo Drainage Scheme, *July 7*, 1459.
    Cattle Plague, *July 7*, 1461.
    Khedive—Visit to England, *June 25*, 86.
    Liquor Traffic—Compensation Claim, *July 7*, 1462.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
  Egypt—*cont.*
    Mohammed Elal, Case of, *June 25*, 87.
    Newspaper Statement on Soudan Disturbance, *July 7*, 1459.
    Special Tribunal Decree, *June 30*, 567, 568.
    University Proposals, *July 7*, 1462.
  Hague Conference Final Act, Signing of, *June 30*, 566.
  Irish Universities Bill, Vatican Opinion of, *June 30*, 568.
  Jerusalem—British Post Office, *July 1*, 745.
  Korea—Bethell Case, *July 2*, 952, 953.
  Macedonian Reform Proposals—Tabling of Agreement, *July 2*, 957.
  Montenegro—British Representation, *June 25*, 84.
  Moray Firth Trawling—Progress of Negotiations, *June 25*, 84; *July 8*, 1769–1774.
  Morocco—Capture of Mr. Clark-Kennedy, *June 25*, 89.
  Motors—Foreign Law and Practice, *July 7*, 1461.
  Muscat—Traffic in Arms, *June 30*, 570.
  Persia
    Condition of, *June 25*, 87, 88; *June 30*, 568, 569.
    Martial Law in, *July 2*, 954.
    Papers, Tabling of, *July 7*, 1460.
    Tabriz, Situation in, *July 2*, 954.
    Teheran Legation Guards, *July 2*, 956, 957.
      British Legation, Persian Troops surrounding, *July 2*, 957; *July 7*, 1460.
  Russia
    King's Visit—Matters discussed, *July 2*, 958.
    Luxenburg Case, *July 2*, 953.
    Tea Dutes—Revision Proposals, *July 2*, 955.
  Servia, British Relations with, *June 25*, 85.
  Soudan—Sentence on Abdul Kader, *June 25*, 86.
  Suez Canal Revenue—Adjustment of Surplus, *June 29*, 330.
  Sugar—British Government Attitude towards Russian Export, *June 25*, 83.
  Turkey
    Awgo, Building at, *July 7*, 1461, 1462.
    Salonika, State of, *June 30*, 567.
  United States—Liquor Licence Duties, *July 2*, 958.

Greystones Harbour
Condition of.
Qs. Mr. Muldoon, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *June 29*, 378.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
Vivisection—Dog-Licences taken out by certain Institutions, *July 2*, 941.

Griffith Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 30*, 587.

"Grindon Hall," s.s.
Loss of, Preliminary Inquiry into.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 6*, 1152–1154; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 1156; Lord Ellenborough, 1157; Marquess of Salisbury, 1158.

Guiana, British
Militia, Circular as to.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 1*, 753.

Guinness, Mr. W. [Bury St. Edmunds]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con., June 26*, 236, 239, 244, 253, 255, 258, 264, 266, 274, 277.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 3R., *June 30*, 713–716.
Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Con., July 3*, 1094, 1099.
Yeomanry Enlistment in Territorial Force, *June 25*, 66.

Gulland, Mr. J. W. [Dumfries Burghs]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con., June 26*, 233.
Secretary of State for Scotland—Position and Work of Office, *June 25*, 117–120.
Tuberculosis—Scottish Preventive measures, *June 25*, 97.

Gurdon, Rt. Hon. Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
Parliamentary Procedure—Teller receiving Bows of Members without removing his own hat, *July 1*, 893.

Gurtienminogue
Case of B. Radford.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 30*, 561.

Gwynn, Mr. S. L. [Galway]
Galway Poor Rate Collector's Poundage Fees, *July 8*, 1668.
Gooseberry Mildew, Prevention of, *July 8*, 1665.

Haddock, Mr. G. B. [Lancashire, North Lonsdale]
Mohmand Rising—Troops engaged, *June 29*, 327.

Hague Conference
Final Act, Signing of.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *June 30*, 566.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
Africa, South—Cost of Middleburg Farm, etc., *June 29*, 344.
Artillery Establishment, *July 6*, 1234.
Auxiliary Forces, Strength of, *July 7*, 1456.
Bechuanaland Expedition, Medal for, *June 25*, 71.
Canadian Militia, Ross Rifle for, *July 6*, 1215.
Cardwell System, Proposals for Modifying, *June 29*, 348.
Cavalry
  Scotland—Regiments for, *June 29*, 347.
  Sword, *July 6*, 1230.
Gillen, J., Case of, *June 29*, 329.
Glasgow—Territorial Force Ammunition, Cost of, *June 25*, 65.
Guns, Converted Fifteen Pounder, Shells for, *June 25*, 65.
Horses, Supply of, *July 7*, 1456.
Infantry of the Line, Reduction of, *July 6*, 1233.
Line Battalions, Strength of, *July 6*, 1235.
Militia Disbanded Units—Disposal of Officers, *June 26*, 221.
Officers—Orders bestowed in 1907, *June 29*, 329.
Piershill Barracks, State of, *June 29*, 348.
Reconnaissances, Value of, *July 6*, 1231.
Salisbury Plain—Land available for Small Holdings, *July 6*, 1235.
Soldiers—Penal Servitude Cases in 1907, *June 29*, 344.
Southampton Territorial Force Association Poster, *July 6*, 1225.
Special Reserve
  Sergeants-Major, Position of, *July 7*, 1457.
  Transfer to, *July 6*, 1232.
Spies, Rumours as to, *July 6*, 1230, 1231.
Territorial Force
  Boots, Provision of, *July 8*, 1649.
  Classification of Marksmen, *June 25*, 65.
  Enlistments, *July 6*, 1227, 1228.
  Naval Dockyard Employees, Service of, *July 6*, 1227.
  Officers, Experience of, *June 25*, 65.
  Strength of, *July 7*, 1454.
  West Riding Enlistments, *July 7*, 1456.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
  Volunteers
    Argyle and Bute Garrison Artillery (1st)—Guns and Officers' Uniforms, etc., *June 25*, 71.
    Long-Service Medal, *July 6*, 1226; *July 7*, 1455.
    Permanent Staff Pay under New Scheme, *June 29*, 347.
  War Office
    Coal, Expenditure on, *July 6*, 1232.
    Use of Room in by Mr. Churchill, *June 29*, 348.
  Woolwich Arsenal
    Ansell, W. E., Case of, *June 25*, 72.
    Boys employed, *June 25*, 66.
    Discharges in 1908, *July 6*, 1229.
    Reynolds, J., Case of, *July 6*, 1229, 1230.
  Yeomanry Enlistment in Territorial Force, *June 25*, 66.

Half-Timers
  Committee of Inquiry, Proposals for. *Qs.* Mr. Clynes; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 7*, 1470.
  Q. Mr. W. R. Rea; *A.* Mr Runciman, *June 30*, 576.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
  Flour Adulteration with Talc, *June 29*, 334.

Halsbury, Earl of
  Merchant Ships Missing, Board of Trade Inquiry into Cases of, proposed, *July 6*, 1162.

Hamble River
  Navigation and Mooring of Destroyers in. *Qs.* Mr. Ashley, Mr. A. Lee, Mr. Gretton, Sir R. Hobart, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 7*, 1452.

Hamilton Rock
  Lighting of. *Qs.* Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *June 25*, 89.

Hamilton of Dalzell, Lord
  "Bengore Head," s.s., Causes of Accidents to, in Portsmouth Harbour, *July 1*, 712.
  Board of Trade (Provisional Orders) Bill, 2R,, *July 7*, 1421–1424.
  "Grindon Hall," s.s., Loss of, Preliminary Inquiry into, *July 6*, 1156.
  Merchant Shipping
    Desertions in Foreign Ports 1904–1908 — Return proposed, *June 29*, 311.
    Discipline, Method of Preserving, *June 29*, 310.

Hamilton of Dazell, Lord—*cont.*
  Merchant Shipping—*cont.*
    Foreign Systems of Pensions, Medical Aid, etc.—Delay in issuing Return, *June 29*, 309.
    Missing Ships, Board of Trade Inquiry in Cases of, proposed, *July 6*, 1155.
    Sunday Labour, Regulations as to, *June 29*, 310.
    "Neptune," s.s., Inquiry into Loss of, proposed, *July 6*, 1156.

Handloom Weaving (Ireland) Bill
  c. 2R., *July 3*, 1144.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancs. N.E., Rossendale]
  Bristol Post Office Extension—Wages paid by Contractor, *July 2*, 968.
  House of Commons Police Duties, *June 29*, 364.
  Hyde Park Carriage Entrances, *July 6*, 1254, 1255.
  Law Courts Accommodation, Inquiry into proposed, *June 25*, 55.
  Mall to Charing Cross Improvement, Information as to, *June 30*, 572, 573.
  Marble Arch Coffee Stall, Removal of, *June 25*, 56.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 408, 409, 461–463, 467, 469; *June 30*, 591, 593, 637, 638, 639, 685.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil]
  Business of the House, Course of, *July 7*, 1480.
  Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1281–1288.
  India
    Calcutta—Bomb found on Scottish Mission Church Steps, *June 30*, 563.
    Postal Service, *July 7*, 1457, 1458.
    Ramchandra Naryen Mendlik, Case of, *June 29*, 349.
    Thakur Ram Singh, Case of, *July 1*, 752.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 398; *July 1*, 823; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1559, 1563, 1567, 1570; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1386.
  Orkney—Bay of Firth Oyster Beds, *June 29*, 372, 373.
  Persia—Legation Guards, *July 2*, 950.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
  Gooseberry Mildew Outbreak in 1908, *June 25*, 68; *July 1*, 745.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 381, 416-418.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 274.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 7*, 1527.

Harmsworth, Mr. C. B. [Worcestershire, Droitwich]
Autumn Session, *July 7*, 1479.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 256.
Tea Imports in 1907–1908, *July 7*, 1446.
Tobacco Cultivation, Assistance to, *July 7*, 1479.
Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 229.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to enforcing three mile limit, etc., *July 8*, 1753.

Harrington, Mr. T. [Dublin Harbour]
National School Teachers
  Dismissals, Regulations as to, *July 2*, 1046, 1047.
  Liquor Licences, Regulations as to Teachers having connection with, *July 2*, 1046.

Harris, Lord
Yeomanry
  Pay of Officers transferred to Territorial Force, *July 8*, 1617, 1618, 1625, 1629.
  Squadron Drill Pay, Abolition of, *July 8*, 1619, 1629.
  Training and Drill Regulations, *July 8* 1617, 1620, 1621.

Harris, Mr. F. L. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1304.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 3R., *June 30*, 716.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1400.

Hart-Davies, Mr. T. [Hackney, N.]
Arms Conference—Date of Conclusion, etc., *July 2*, 955.
Muscat—Traffic in Arms, *June 29*, 354.
Persia—Afghan Occupation of Regan, *June 29*, 354.
Persian Gulf—Gun-running, *June 29*, 354.
Police—Annual Holiday, *July 1*, 755.
Polling arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1097.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
Tramcar Accidents, Prevention of, *July 6*, 1217.
University of London, Objections to Amendment of Statute 4, *June 29*, 491.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
Admiralty, Fires, Loss and Damage by, *June 25*, 72 ; *July 2*, 947.
Jamaica Loan Applications, *July 2*, 972.
Madagascar—Indentured Labour for the Transvaal, *July 2*, 950.
Postmaster-General, Assistance to, by Lord Granard, etc., *June 25*, 113, 114.
Unemployed Officers, Procedure in Dismissing, *June 25*, 91, 92.
Wireless Telegraphy—Tapping of Messages, *July 2*, 945, 946.
Women Suffragists' Prison Treatment, *July 2*, 958, 959, 960.

Hayti
Trade Report Presented, *June 25*, 3.

Hazleton, Mr. R. [Galway, N.]
Education, Ireland
  Bi-lingual Programme, *July 2*, 990.
  National School Teachers
    Grievances of, *July 2*, 990.
    Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2*, 991–994.
  Primary, Condition of, *July 2*, 989.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1113, 1118, 1122.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
Irish Fairs, Regulation of, *July 7*, 1451.
National School Teachers' Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2*, 1031–1035, 1077, 1078.
Women Suffragists Prison Treatment, *July 2*, 959, 960.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury]
Jerusalem—British Post Office, *July 1*, 744.
Motor and Horse Cabs in London, *July 2*, 934.
Omnibuses—Number in London, *July 2*, 934.

Helmsdale Harbour
State of.
  Q. Mr. Morton ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 8*, 1649.

Helmsley, Viscount [Yorks., N.R., Thirsk]
Colonial Loans, Return as to, *July 2*, 935.
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1140.

Hemmerede, Mr. E. G. [Denbighshire, E.]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1302–1307.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 235, 236, 237, 239, 242, 243, 244, 246, 256, 262.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 451 ; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1411, 1412.

Heneage, Lord
Horses—Census of all available Horses in Great Britain and Ireland, proposed, *July 6*, 1187.

Herbert, Colonel Sir I. [Monmouthshire]
Marines—Working of New Training Scheme, *July 8*, 1726–1728.
Naval Interchangeability System—Inquiry proposed, *July 8*, 1724–1728.
St. Brides School Children at Otter-Hunt, *July 6*, 1254.

Herbert, Mr. T. A. [Bucks., Wycombe]
Army Territorial Force, Boots for, *July 8*, 1649.
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1103–1105.

Hills, Mr. J. W. [Durham]
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 1*, 831–834.

Historical Monuments
See Ancient Monuments.

Hobart, Sir R. [Hants, New Forest]
Hamble River Navigation, *July 7*, 1454.
Licensing Bill—Application to Wine Trade, *July 7*, 1479.

Hobhouse, Mr. E. H. *Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Bristol, E.]
Alcohol, Industrial Use of—Conditions of Authorising, *July 2*, 973.
Bank of Ireland, Government Relations with, *July 8*, 1678.
Bank Notes, Irish
  Commission Charged on, *June 30*, 588, 589.
  Payment of, *July 6*, 1259.
Civil Service
  Assistant Clerks (New Class) Employment of, *June 29*, 332.
   Boy Clerks, *July 6*, 1256.
  Territorial Force Training Facilities, *June 29*, 329; *July 2*, 974; *July 6*, 1236.
Colonial Loans, Return as to, *July 2*, 935.
Dividing Societies—Valuation System, *July 7*, 1472.
Education
  Grant, Additional, Distribution of *June 26*, 220.
  National School Teachers' Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2*, 1076.
Greystones Harbour, Condition of, *June 29*, 378, 379.
Income-Tax—American Beef Trust Returns, *July 8*, 1659.
Inverliever Estate
  Price of, *July 1*, 744.
  Work on, *July 8*, 1664, 1665.

Hobhouse, Mr. E. H.—*cont.*
Jamaica Loan Applications, *July 2*, 972.
Land Act Sinking Fund, *July 7*, 1477.
Land Purchase Stock issued, *July 8*, 1677.
Meenbanid, Railway Station for, *July 7*, 1444.
Old-age Pensions Bill—Out-door Relief Disqualification, *July 2*, 974.
Post Office—Employment of Boy Clerks, *July 6*, 1255.
Queen's Colleges—*Status* of Professors, *July 2*, 983.
Tax Revenue, *July 2*, 973.
Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 231.
Vivisection—Dog Licences taken out by certain Institutions, *July 2*, 941.
Welsh University Report, *July 8*, 1659.

Holderness Water Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 2*, 932.
  Con. and 3R.* *July 8*, 1630.
l. 1R.* *July 8*, 1593.

Holt, Mr. R. D. [Northumberland, Hexham]
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1382.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.
Under-Secretary—Mr. H. Samuel.

Honduras, British
Railway Construction Petition.
  Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Col. Seely, *July 1*, 753.

Honourable Artillery Company Bill
l. 3R.* *June 25*, 2.
c. 1R.* *June 25*, 50.
  2R.* *July 6*, 1205.

Hop Industry
Import Duties.
  Q. Mr. Verney; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *June 25*, 70.
Select Committee Report, etc., Presented, *July 6*, 1261.

Hope, Mr. James [Sheffield, Central]
Belgium, Cost of living in, *July 6*, 1249.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 2*, 987.
French Tariff Commission, *July 6*, 1237
Navy Estimates, Time allotted to, *July 1*, 747.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *June 29*, 470 471, 472; *June 30*, 602, 680; *July 6*, 1351, 1363; *July 7*, 1561.

Horniman, Mr. E. J. [Chelsea]
  Ancient Monuments—Royal Commission for England and Wales, *July 6*, 1209.
  Statues in London, Police Report on, proposed, *June 29*, 325.
  Training Colleges, Admission Regulations, *June 29*, 324.

Horses
  Army, *see that title.*
  Breeding
    Government Action, necessity for.
      Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 6*, 1163–1169, 1188; Lord Ribblesdale, 1169–1172; Earl of Erroll, 1172–1176; Earl of Onslow, 1178; Earl Carrington, 1184—1187; Lord Saltoun, 1187.
    Mares, Possibility of checking Export of.
      Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 6*, 1166.
    Registration of Stock, Scheme for.
      Os. Earl Carrington, *July 6*, 1184.
    Report and Recommendations of Royal Commission.
      Os. Earl Carrington, *July 6*, 1179–1181.
    Stallions, Increasing Number of, proposed.
      Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 6*, 1166; Earl Carrington, 1179.
  Census of all available Horses in Great Britain and Ireland, proposed.
    Os. Lord Lovat, *July 6*, 1176, 1177, 1182, 1183; Earl Carrington, 1176, 1182, 1183, 1188; Lord Ribblesdale, 1182; Lord Heneage, 1187.
  Three Year olds, purchase of, proposed.
    Os. Earl Carrington, *July 6*, 1185, 1186.

Housing, Town Planning &c. Bill
  Proposals as to.
    Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 6*, 1251.

Howard, Mr. G. [Cumberland, Eskdale]
  Army Service Corps, Pay of, *July 2*, 949.

Hudson, Mr. W. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
  Admiralty Contracts—Wages paid by Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., *June 29*, 341, 342.
  Postmasters, Sub., Remuneration of, *June 30*, 574.

Hull
  Post Office—Split Duties.
    Q. Mr. Ferens; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6*, 1216.

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill
  l. 3R.* *June 30*, 494.
  c. Lords Amendts., *Con.*,* *July 6*, 1205.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
  Army Special Reserve—Exemption from Jury Service etc., *July 8*, 1655.
  Lords-Lieutenant, System of appointing, *July 3*, 1682.
  Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 602.

Hutton, Mr. A. E. [Yorkshire, W.R., Morley]
  Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1130.

Hyde Park
  Carriage entrances on North Side.
    Qs. Mr. H. Gooch, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *July 6*, 1254.

Imports
  See Exports and Imports.

Incest Bill
  c. Con., *June 26*, 278.
    3R.* *July 3*, 1090.
  l. 1R.* *July 6*, 1149.

Inchiquin Estate
  Sale Proposals.
    Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 978.

Income Tax
  American Beef Trust profits.
    Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 8*, 1659.
  Appeals, Procedure in hearing.
    Q. Sir H. Aubrey-Fletcher; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 7*, 1462.
  Betting Profits, Assessment of.
    Qs. Mr. Bottomley, Mr. Clynes; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 7*, 1464.
  Leases, payment on Renewal of.
    Qs. Mr. Bottomley; *As.* Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 30*, 590.

India
  Accounts and Estimates—Explanatory Memorandum Presented, *June 29*, 295, 323.
  Administrative Policy.
    Os. Viscount Morley, *June 30*, 529–533; Earl Cromer, 535; Lord Ampthill, 545–547; Lord Courtney, 548; Lord Lamington, 552.
  Army
    Disposition of Scottish Regiments.
      Qs. Mr. Pirie, Mr. C. E. Price; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 8*, 1655.
    Medals for recent operations, Award of.
      Q. Captain A. Murray; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 25*, 79.
  Assam-Bengal Railway, Thefts on.
    Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 2*, 949.

[*con*'.

India—*cont.*
Bengal, Partition of
Local opinion.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 29*, 348.
Unrest due to, alleged.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 510–513, 554, 555; Viscount Morley, 525; Viscount, Middleton, 540, 543; Lord Ampthill, 544, Lord Courtney, 549.
Budget, Date of Taking.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 7*, 1444.
Calcutta
Assasination of Constable.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 30*, 559.
Model Liquor Shops Scheme.
Q. Mr. N. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 25*, 77.
Scottish Mission Church Steps, Bomb found on.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 30*, 563.
Chittagong Jetty Fires.
Q. Mr. Rees. *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 2*, 949.
Condition of—Causes of Unrest, etc.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 498–500, 505–520; Viscount Morley, 532, 529.
Eastern Bengal and Assam Era, Statement published in.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 30*, 564.
Educational System, Evils of.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 506; Earl of Cromer, 534; Lord Courtney, 548, 549; Lord Lamington, 550, 551.
Frontier Disturbances, Causes of, etc.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 500–502. Viscount Morley, 527.
Fuller, Sir Bampfylde—Circumstances of Resignation.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 514, 515; Viscount Morley, 526; Earl of Cromer, 533.
Jasdan Succession.
Q. Mr. E. H. Lamb; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 8*, 1644.
Mohmand Rising
Papers, Issue of.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 30*, 565.
Troops engaged.
Q. Mr. Haddock; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 29*, 327.
Opium, *see that title.*
Postal Service
Parcel Post Rates.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 7*, 1457.

India—*cont.*
Postal Service—*cont.*
Pay in.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 7*, 1457.
Registration Fees.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 7*, 1458.
Press Act, Terms of.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 517, 518; Lord Ampthill, 546; Lord Lamington, 553.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees, Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 25*, 78.
Report of Debate on.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 30*, 565.
Ramchandra Naryen Mendlik, Case of.
Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 29*, 349.
Reform Proposals, Date of submitting.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 25*, 114.
Seditious Writings and Meetings, Effect of.
Os. Lord Curzon, *June 30*, 505, 509, 516; Earl of Cromer, 536–538.
Simla Scheme.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 29*, 349.
Tea, Russian Duty on, *see under* Russia.
Thakur Bahadur Singh and Thakur Ram Singh, Cases of.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees, Mr. K. Hardie; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 1*, 750, 752.

India Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Viscount Morley.
Under-Secretary—Rt. Hon. T. R. Buchanan.

Industrial and Reformatory Schools
See Reformatory and Industrial Schools.

Insurance Agents
Number committing Suicide.
Q. Mr. W. Thorne; *A.* Mr. H. Samuel, *July 7*, 1465.

Inverliever Estate
Price of.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 1*, 743.
Work and Expenditure on.
Qs. Lord Balcarres, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 8*, 1664.

Ireland
Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.
Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.
Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.
Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry.
[*For* Particular Places, Estates, etc., *see their Names.*]

Ireland—*cont.*

Afforestation—*See* Forestry.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*

Bureau of Commerce for, proposed.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 8*, 1647.

Cattle-Drives

Attitude of the Government.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 101.

Cases in 1908.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 8*, 1669.

Effect of System of dealing with Offenders.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 1*, 773.

Condition of.
Os. Lord Ashbourne, *July 7*, 1432–1435.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Asquith, *June 30*, 584.

Constabulary, *see that title.*

Consumption in.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 8*, 1648.

Co-operation among Farmers.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 7*, 1446.

Crown Jewels, Loss of.
Qs. Mr. W. Moore; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 979.

Development Grant—Revised Estimate.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 8*, 1667.

Education, *see that title.*

Estimates, *see under* Supply.

Evictions

Reinstatement

Applications, System of dealing with.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 339.

Return Presented, *July 3*, 1082; *July 6*, 1147.

Fairs, Regulation of.
Q. Mr. Healy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 7*, 1451.

Fisheries, *see that title.*

Land Acts, Land Commission, Land Judges Court, and Land Purchase, *see those titles.*

Outrages Reported in May.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 99.

Police, *see* Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police.

Ireland—*cont.*

Proclaimed Counties, Constabulary Force in—Return as to Cost, Strength, etc., proposed.
Os. Lord Killanin, *July 7*, 1424; Lord Denman, 1432.

Effect of Proclamation.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 101.

Extra Expenditure involved by Disturbances, Method of Allocating.
Os. Lord Killanin, *July 7*, 1424–1430, 1437; Lord Denman, 1429–1431; Lord Ashbourne, 1432–1435; Earl of Mayo, 1435–1437; Earl of Crewe, 1438.

Queen's Colleges — *Status* of Professors.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 2*, 983.

Trade Commissioner for certain Colonies.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 7*, 1476.

Trade Mark as Evidence of Origin, Acceptance of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *June 30*, 571.

Trade Statistics, Accuracy of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 25*, 57.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 6*, 1218.

Irish Universities Bill

c. Report from Standing Committee C., *July 8*, 1683.

Extern Students.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 327.

Proposals as to.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 30*, 586.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 30*, 588.

Vatican Opinion of.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *June 30*, 568.

Isle of Man (Customs Duties) Bill

c. 1R*, *July 1*, 780.

Italy

Trade Report Presented, *June 25*, 3; *July 1*, 730.

Jacoby, Sir J. A. [Derbyshire, Mid.]

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Date of Taking, *June 29*, 380.

Strawberries — Price charged by Kitchen Committee, *June 29*, 371, 372.

James of Hereford, Lord

Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 21.

Marriage Act (Amendment) Bill, 2R, *June 30*, 495.

Jamaica
  Kingston Improvement Proposals.
    Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 25*, 81.
  Loans, Applications for.
    Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 2*, 972.

Japan
  Hok Kaido—Report Presented, *July 7*, 1418.
  Trade Report Presented, *June 25*, 3.

Jardine, Sir J. [Roxburghshire]
  Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 227.

Jenkins, Mr. J. [Chatham]
  Admiralty, Deputations to, *July 8*, 1743.

Jerusalem
  British Post Office.
    Q. Mr. J. H. Heaton; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 1*, 744.

Johnson, Mr. W. [Warwickshire, Nuneaton]
  Taxation, Local — Date of Transfer of Levy of Licence Duties, *July 8*, 1643.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1387–1389, 1394.
  War Office Contracts for Tartan Cloth, *July 2*, 948.
  Westminster Church Army March on 4th April, Drunkenness observed during, *July 2*, 962.

Jones, Sir D. B. [Swansea District]
  Welsh University Report, *July 8*, 1658.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
  Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com. June 30*, 656.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
  Foynes—Telegraphic Address of O'Connor, *July 8*, 1678.
  Pilot Pilotage
    Clyde Pilot, Charge against, *June 29*, 374; *July 6*, 1257, 1258.
    United Kingdom Pilots Association, Deputation of, *June 25*, 90.

Joynson-Hicks, Mr. [Manchester, N.W.]
  Lights on Vehicles Act—Application to Harvesting Vehicles, *July 6*, 1245.
  Old-Age Pensions Bill, *recom. July 6*, 1403.
  United States Tax on British Travellers, *July 6*, 1238.

Kavanagh, Mr. [Carlow]
  Land Act Sinking Fund, *July 7*, 1477.

Kearley, Sir H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary Board of Trade* [Devonport.]
  French Tariff Proposals, *July 8*, 1658.
  Hamilton Rock, Lighting of, *June 25*, 89.
  Hop Industry—Import Duties, *June 25*, 71.
  Meat, Railway Charges for Conveyance of, *June 25*, 91.
  Railways — Complaints against Carriage Doors of District Company, *June 25*, 90.
  United Kingdom Pilots Association, Deputation of, *June 25*, 90.

Keighley Corporation Bill.
  c. 2R.* *June 29*, 321.

Kekewick, Sir G. W. [Exeter]
  Post Office Employment of Boy Clerks, *July 6*, 1255.
  Superannuation (Post Office and War Office) Act.
    Retirement Age, *July 6*, 1210.
    Return under Clause 5, *July 6*, 1209.

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H. [Devon, Honiton]
  Nigeria
    Northern—Spirit-Smuggling, *June 29*, 351.
    Southern
      Fines paid in Gin, *June 29*, 350.
      Spirit Traffic, Control of, *June 29*, 350.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
  Tax Revenue, *July 2*, 935, 973.

Kenyon, Lord
  Commons Bill, 2R. *July 2*, 929.

Kerry
  Evicted Tenants reinstated.
    Q. Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 6*, 1214.

Kettle, Mr. T. M. [Tyrone, E.]
  Education—Intermediate Rules, *June 25*, 67.
  Egypt
    Khedive—Visit to England, *June 25*, 85.
    Mohammed Elal, Case of, *June 25*, 86, 87.
  Soudan—Sentence on Abdul Kader, *June 25*, 86.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
  Women's Suffrage Movement—Prison Treatment, *July 6*, 1244.

Kilbrin
  Case of J. Nash.
    Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 935.

Kildorrery
Case of J. Magner.
Q. Mr. Abraham ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July* 7, 1449.

Killanin, Lord
Galway Extra Police, Charge for, *July* 1424, 1427, 1428.
Proclaimed Counties
Constabulary Force in—Return as to Cost, Strength, etc., proposed, *July* 7, 1424.
Extra Expenditure involved by Disturbances, Method of Allocating, *July 7*, 1424-1430, 1437.

Kilmurray
Police Presence at Meeting
Q. Mr. W. Redmond ; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 6*, 1213.

Kiltoghert
Cattle-drive—Decision as to Prosecution.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 109.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale ; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 1*, 772.

Kimber, Sir H. [Wandsworth]
Weir Charity, Administration of, *June 30*, 583, 584.

Kincaid-Smith, Capt. M. [Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon]
Army
Auxiliary Forces, Strength of, *July 7*, 1454.
Territorial Force, Strength of, *July 7*, 1454.
National Military Training (No. 2) Bill, *Intro.*, *July 7*, 1481-1484.

King's College, London (Transfer) Bill
c. 3R.* *June 25*, 48
l. Commons Amendments, *Con.** *June 29*, 293.

Kinnaird, Lord
Nurses Registration Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1197.

Knockanes
Case of D. Healy.
Qs. Mr. J. Murphy ; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 104.

Korea
Bethell Case,
Qs. Mr. Smeaton ; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 952.

Labour Colonies
Hollesley Bay, Report on.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 2*, 970.

Labourers (Ireland) Bill
Section 6 (2) Interpretation of.
Q. Mr. Meagher ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 104.
Transactions under
Q. Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 328.

Lagos
Railway Lands, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood ; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 2*, 952.

Laidlaw, Mr. R. [Renfrewshire, E.]
Taxicabs, Speed of, *July 6*, 1244.

Lamb, Mr. E. H. [Rochester]
India—Jasdan Succession, *July 8*, 1644.

Lambert, Mr. G.—*Lord of the Admiralty* [Devon, S. Molton]
Admiralty—Damage from Fires, *July 2*, 947.
Australian Commonwealth—Naval Defence Scheme, *July 2*, 946, 947.
Coastguard Men Required for Manœuvres, *July 1*, 748.
Dockyards Employees, Territorial Army Service of, *July 1*, 749, 750.
Estimates, Time allotted to, *July 1*, 747, 748.
Grog Ration, Allowance in lieu of, proposed, *July 1*, 749.
"Highflyer," Repairs to, *July 1*, 746, 747.
"Irresistible"—Report on Flooding of Engine-room, *July 1*, 748.
Naval Volunteers (Lands) Bill, Facilities for, *July 2*, 946.
Wireless Telegraphy—Tapping of Messages, *July 2*, 945, 946.

Lamington, Lord
India
Administrative Policy, *June 30*, 552.
Education System, Evils of, *June 30*, 550, 551.
Press Act, Terms of, *June 30*, 553.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]
"Arcadia"—Capture within German Territorial Limit, *June 29*, 355.
"Commonwealth" H.M.S., Cost of Repairs to, *June 25*, 73.
Education (Scotland) Bill—Effect of Amending Clause 9 (1), *June 29*, 372.
Hamilton Rock, Lighting of, *June 25*, 89.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 260, 263.
Naval Volunteers (Lands) Bill, Facilities for, *July 2*, 946.
West Indies—Federation Proposals, *June 25*, 80.

Lanarkshire (Middle Ward District) Water Order Confirmation Bill
c. 3R.* *June 26*, 217.
l. 1R.* *June 29*, 294.
3R.* *July 6*, 1147.

Lanarkshire Tramways Order Confirmation Bill
l. 1R., 2R. and *Com.** *June 25*, 3.
3R.* *July 2*, 901.

Land Act, 1903
Sinking Fund.
Q. Mr. Kavanagh; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 7*, 1477.

Land Drainage Provisional Order Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 7*, 1417.
Com. and *Rep.** *July 8*, 1593.

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887
Section 7, Repeal of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 106.

Land Purchase (Ireland)
[*For Particular Estates, etc., see their Names.*]
Advances—Returns Presented, *June 29*, 295, 323; *July 6*, 1148, 1208.
Annuities
Amount Collectable.
Q. Mr. W. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 30*, 561.
Arrears.
Qs. Mr. W. O'Brien; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 8*, 1637, 1666.
Evidence taken before Departmental Committee—Tabling proposed.
Os. Earl of Mayo, *July 2*, 929, 930; Lord Denman, 929; Earl of Crewe, 930.
Fund, Claims upon and Payments out of to 31st May, 1908.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *June 25*, 23, 24; Lord Denman, 23.
Funds, Delay in Provision and Distribution of.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *June 30*, 495.
Stock—Amount issued, etc.
Q. Mr. G. D. Faber; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 8*, 1676.
Transactions.
Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 26*, 218.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 1219.

Land Values (Scotland) Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 2*, 902.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G. [Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash]
Army
Horses, Supply of, *July 7*, 1456.
Territorial Force—West Riding Enlistments, *July 7*, 1456.
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1136.
Small Holdings—Difficulty in obtaining Land, *June 29*, 367.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 9–13; *Com.*, *July 8*, 1606–1609.
Land Values (Scotland) Bill, *Rep.*, *July 3*, 916–920.
Nurses Registration Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1201–1203.

Lardner, Mr. J. C. R. [Monaghan, N.]
National School Teachers' Salaries, Conditions of Granting Increase, *July 2*, 1047–1049.

Law, Mr. A. B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1310–1325.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]
Dairies, etc., Order, Protests against, *July 3*, 1089.
Fisheries
Cruisers for Protection of, *June 25*, 57.
Grant from Department, *June 25*, 56.
"Helga," Provision of, *June 25*, 56.
Meenbanid, Railway Station for, *July 7*, 1444.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 431; *July 1*, 830.
Sheephaven Bay, Trawling in, *June 25*, 58.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1121.

Law Courts
Accommodation, Inquiry into proposed.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *June 25*, 55.
Irish Funds, Investment of.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 7*, 1472.
Supreme Court Rules—Order-in-Council Presented, *July 7*, 1418, 1442.

Law Guarantee Trust and Accident and United Legal Indemnity Insurance Societies Bill
l. Bill not to be Proceeded with, *June 29*, 293.

Law of Distress Amendment Bill
_c. Con._* _July 3_, 1101.
3R.* _July 3_, 1106.
_l._ 1R.* _July 6_, 1149.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
Motor Speed Limit in London, _July 7_, 1468.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, _Recom._, _July 6_, 1397; _July 7_, 1530.
Soldiers—Penal Servitude Cases in 1907, _June 29_, 344.
Westminster Church Army March on 4th April, _July 6_, 1241, 1242.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hampshire, Fareham]
Civil Servants' Territorial Training Leave, _July 6_, 1236.
Hamble River Navigation, _July 7_, 1453.
Naval Education and Training—Interchangeability System, _July 8_, 1738.
Persian Legation Guards, Payment of Cost of, _July 2_, 950.
Southampton Territorial Force Association Poster, _July 6_, 1224.

Leeds Corporation Bill
_l._ 3R.* _July 8_, 1593.

Lehmann, Mr. R. C. [Leicester, Market Harborough]
Salisbury Plain—Land Available for Small Holdings, _July 6_, 1235.

Leicester Corporation Bill
_l._ 3R.* _June 29_, 293.

Leith Burgh Bill
_l._ 3R.* _June 29_, 293.
_c._ 1R.* _June 29_, 322.
2R.* _July 8_, 1630.

Leitrim
Case of P. Lyons.
_Qs._ Captain Craig; _A._ Mr. Birrell, _June 25_, 98.
State of.
_Q._ Mr. Lonsdale; _A._ Mr. Cherry, _July 8_, 1673.

Levy, Sir M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, _Com._, _July 1_, 813, 835.

Lewis, Island of
Evictions.
_Qs._ Mr. Weir, _June 25_, 123.
Farms, Area of.
_Q._ Mr. Weir; _A._ Mr. Sinclair, _July 8_, 1634.
Migration Scheme.
_Qs._ Mr. Weir; _As._ Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Speaker, _July 1_, 767.
_Qs._ Mr. Weir; _As._ Mr. Sinclair, _July 3_, 1085; _July 8_, 1661.

Lewis, Island of—_cont._
Poor Rate.
_Q._ Mr. Younger; _A._ Mr. Sinclair, _June 29_, 375.
Rate Arrears, Grants in respect of.
_Qs._ Mr. Weir; _As._ Mr. Sinclair, _July 8_, 1660.
Rating _impasse._
_Qs._ Mr. Younger, _June 25_, 127; Mr. Sinclair, 128, 158.
Sanitary State.
_Q._ Mr. Weir; _A._ Mr. Sinclair, _July 8_, 1660.
Stornoway—Report on Sanitation.
_Qs._ Mr. Weir, Mr. Rees; _As._ Mr. Sinclair, _July 1_, 766.
Upper Bayble School Facilities.
_Q._ Mr. Weir; _A._ Mr. Sinclair, _June 25_, 95.

Licensing Bill
Lease granted for Ninety-nine Years, Application to.
_Qs._ Mr. Younger; _As._ Mr. Asquith, _July 7_, 1478.
Wine Trade, Application to.
_Q._ Sir R. Hobart; _A._ Mr. Asquith, _July 7_, 1479.

Lights on Vehicles Act
Harvesting Vehicles, Application to.
_Q._ Mr. Joynson-Hicks; _A._ Mr. Gladstone, _July 6_, 1245.

Limerick Competitions
Legality of.
_Q._ Mr. Byles; _A._ Sir W. Robson, _June 25_, 58.

Liquor Traffic
Dominoes, etc., in Public-houses.
_Qs._ Mr. C. Roberts; _As._ Mr. Gladstone, _June 29_, 361.
Wine and Spirit Merchants' Licences.
_Q._ Mr. McArthur; _A._ Mr. Asquith, _July 2_, 985.

Liverpool Corporation (General Powers) Bill
_c._ 3R.* _June 29_. 321.
_l._ 2R.* _July 6_, 1145.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—_Chancellor of the Exchequer_ (Carnarvon Boroughs)
Banks—Unclaimed Balances
Compulsory Statement proposed, _June 25_, 64.
Estimate of, _June 29_, 357, 358.
Practice in classing Accounts as Unclaimed, _June 29_, 358.
Cider, proof Spirit in, _June 25_, 64.
Customs and Excise—New Scheme for Excise, _June 25_, 63.
Education Grant, additional, Distribution of, _June 29_, 378; _July 6_, 1219.
Government Unclaimed Stock—Return proposed, _July 6_, 1238, 1239.

[_cont._

Lloyd George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
Income-tax
Appeals, Procedure in hearing, *July 7*, 1463.
Betting profits, Assessment of, *July 7*, 1464.
Leases, Payment on Renewal of, *June 30*, 590.
Local Authorities' Loans, Regulations as to, *June 30*, 559.
National Assurance Company of Ireland—Case of Corrigan *v.* Read, *July 6*, 1212.
National Debt Sinking Fund, Reduction of, *July 6*, 1211.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 381, 382, 384, 393–399, 446, 449, 452, 470, 471, 475, 476; *June 30*, 594, 611, 614–616, 642, 650–652, 655, 662, 686, 687, 690–692; *July 1*, 781, 817–824, 836, 838, 841, 843–847, 851, 852, 854, 859–862; *July 6*, 1343–1346, 1368; *July 7*, 1490, 1511–1513, 1532, 1533, 1539, 1540, 1544, 1545, 1551, 1552, 1554, 1567–1570, 1572–1576; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1379–1381, 1383–1385, 1393–1396.
Clause 3 (*b*) Males likely to be disqualified under, *June 29*, 359.
Cost of Scheme, *July 6*, 1240.
Disqualification under, *July 6*, 1239;
Disqualification Provisions, *July 7*, 1449.
Friendly Societies Thrift Certificates, *July 2*, 944.
Naval and Military Service, Provisions as to, *July 1*, 744, 754.
Pensions Committee, Appointment of *July 6*, 1219.
Pension Officers, Selection of, *July 7*, 1448.
Revenue and Expenditure—Tax Revenue, *July 2*, 936.
Savings Bank—Effect of State-aid, *July 2*, 945.
Sugar Refineries, Cost of Supervising, *June 25*, 62.
Taxation, Local—Collection of Licence Duties, *June 25*, 62; *July 8*, 1643.
Tobacco—Manufacture Regulations and Licences Granted, *June 25*, 70.
Unemployed Grant, *June 25*, 63; *June 29*, 359.
Universities, Welsh, Grants to, *July 2*, 944.

Local Authorities
Accounts, Audit of.
Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 7*, 1467.
Debt, Increase of.
Os. Viscount Wolverhampton, *June 25*, 26.
Loans, Regulations as to.
Q. Sir T. Roe; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 30*, 559.

Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill
c. *Con.*, *June 26*, 233.
3R.* *June 26*, 278.
l. 1R.* *June 29*, 295.

Local Authorities (Advertising) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 7*, 1481.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. John Burns.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. C. F. G. Masterman.

Local Government Board, Scotland
Work of—Delay in effecting Reforms, alleged.
Os. Mr. Morton, *June 25*, 179–182.

Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898
Section 122 (2)—Surplus of Fee Fund.
Q. Mr. Moore; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 940.

Local Government (Ireland) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 2*, 988.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.
c. 2R.* *July 1*, 737.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
c. 2R.* *July 1*, 737.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
c. 2R., *June 30*, 556.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 2*, 901.
*Com. and Rep.** *July 6*, 1146.
3R.* *July 7*, 1418.
c. 1R.* *July 7*, 1440.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 2*, 932.
3R.* *July 3*, 1081.
l. 1R.* *July 6*, 1146.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 25*, 49.
*Con.** *June 26*, 217.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill
c. *Rep.** *June 25*, 49.
*Con.** *June 26*, 217.
3R.* *June 29*, 321.
l. 1R.* *June 30*, 494.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
- *c. Rep.* June 25*, 49.
  - 3r.* *June 26*, 217.
- *l.* 1r.* *June 29*, 294.

Local Government Scotland (No. 2) Bill
- Legislative Proposals for Replacing.
  - *Qs.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 2*, 974.

Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill
- *c.* Report from Standing Committee A, *July 1*, 780.
  - *Con.* July 2*, 1080.
- *l.* 1r.* *July 6*, 1149.
- Date of proceeding with.
  - *Os.* Mr. Muldoon, *July 2*, 1080.

Local Taxation
- *See under* Taxation.

Lockwood, Rt. Hon. Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
- Civil Service—Territorial Force Training Facilities, *June 29*, 329.
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 30*, 643; *July 1*, 808; *July 7*, 1528.
- Spies
  - Legislative Proposals for Dealing with, *July 8*, 1681.
  - Rumours as to, *July 6*, 1230.
- Woolwich Arsenal
  - Ansell, W. E., Case of, *June 25*, 72.
  - Discharges in 1908, *July 6*, 1229.

London
- Street Traffic, *see that title.*

London, County of
- Charities—Return Presented, *July 8*, 1632

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
- *l.* 2r.* *June 29*, 293.

London County Council [Money] Bill
- *c.* 3r., *June 30*, 709.
- *l.* 1r.* *July 1*, 729.
  - 2r.* *July 8*, 1593.

London County Council [Tramways and Improvements] Bill
- *c. Rep.* July 7*, 1439.

London and District Electricity Supply Bill
- *l.* Report from Select Committee, *July 6*, 1146.

London Ports and Docks Bill
- *c.* Order for Second Reading and Bill Withdrawn, *June 25*, 48.

London United Tramways Bill
- *c.* 3r.* *June 26*, 217.

London University
- Position of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. T. F. Richards, Sir W. J. Collins; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *June 29*, 364.
- Statute 4, Objections to Amendment of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Harwood, *June 29*, 491.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
- Education
  - Commission, Constitution of, *July 2*, 1003.
  - National School Teachers' Salaries—Conditions of Granting Increase, *July 2*, 1003–1006, 1074.
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 29*, 385, 397, 409–411, 447, 473–476; *June 30*, 687–689, 692; *July 1*, 781, 783–789, 794, 862–864; *Con., July 6*, 1348–1350, 1369–1372; *July 7*, 1494, 1541–1543; *Recom., July 6*, 1392.

Longford
- Evicted Tenants.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Phillips; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 1220.
- State of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. C. Craig; *As* Mr. Cherry, *July 8*, 1674.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
- Armagh—Boycott of M. McDermott, *June 25*, 110.
- Australian Commonwealth Naval Defence Scheme, *June 29*, 352.
- Cattle-driving
  - Cases in 1908, *July 8*, 1669.
  - Effect of System of Dealing with Offenders, *July 1*, 773, 774.
- Clare, State of, *July 8*, 1670, 1671.
- Dundrum Estate Cattle-drive, Persons Participating in, *July 1*, 775.
- Ennis County Court — Compensation Awarded for Malicious Injuries to Cattle, *June 25*, 109.
- Germany, Cost of Living in—Price of Bread in Return, *July 1*, 764, 765.
- Irish Estimates, Time Allotted to, *July 8*, 1681.
- Killtoghert Cattle-drive, *June 25*, 109, 110; *July 1*, 772, 773.
- Labourers (Ireland) Act, Transactions under, *June 29*, 328.
- Leitrim, State of, *July 8*, 1673, 1674.
- Longford, State of, *July 8*, 1674, 1675.
- Moate Cattle-drive, Cruelties Perpetrated during, *July 1*, 774.
- Morocco—Capture of Mr. Clark Kennedy, *June 25*, 89.

[*cont.*

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.—*cont.*
  Patents Act, 1907—Working of Section 27, *July 1*, 764.
  Rathdowney Disturbance on 20th inst., *June 29*, 328.
  Rathruddy—Outrage at House of M. Glynn, *June 25*, 108.
  Telephone Mouthpieces, Disease Germs in, *June 29*, 363.

Lord Chamberlain
  Viscount Althorp.

Lord Chancellor
  Lord Loreburn.

Lord Chief Justice
  Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
  Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland
  Earl of Aberdeen.

Lord President of the Council
  Right Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.

Lord Privy Seal
  Marquess of Ripon.

Lords-Lieutenant
  System of appointing.
    Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 8*, 1682.

Loreburn, Lord—*Lord Chancellor.*
  Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 20; 3R., *June 30*, 497.
  Criminal Procedure—Delays in Cases of Retrial, *June 26*, 316–318.
  Land Values (Scotland) Bill, *Rep., July 3*, 907–911, 926.
  Militiamen who have not Enlisted in the Special Reserve, Position of, *July 1*, 735–737.

Louth and East Coast Railway (Transfer) Bill
  l. 3R.* *June 30*, 494.
  c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* * *July 6*, 1205.

Lovat, Lord
  Army Territorial Force
    Brigade Staff, Allowances, *July 8*, 1615.
    Horses—Conditions attached to Grant, *July 8*, 1615.
    Medical Examination—Reduction of Fees, *July 8*, 1616.
    Mobilisation Arrangements, *July 8*, 1617.

Lovat, Lord—*cont.*
  Army Territorial Force—*cont.*
    Permanent Staff Grievances, *July 8*, 1614.
    Training Kit, Economies effected in, *July 8*, 1616.
  Horses—Census of all Available Horses in Great Britain and Ireland proposed, *July 6*, 1176, 1177, 1182, 1183.
  Yeomanry
    Netheravon School, Abolition of, *July 8*, 1613.
    Training and Drill Regulations, *July 8*, 1629.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]
  [*For Rulings as Speaker, see titles* Speaker *and* Questions.]

Lucas, Lord
  Under-Secretary of State for War.
  Territorial Force
    Brigade Staff Allowances, *July 8*, 1622.
    Horse Grant, Conditions attached to, *July 8*, 1623.
    Medical Examination—Reduction of Fees, *July 8*, 1624.
    Mobilisation Arrangements, *July 8*, 1625.
    Permanent Staff Grievances, *July 8*, 1622.
    Training Kit, Economies effected in, *July 8*, 1623.
  Training and Drill Regulations, *July 8*, 1627.
  Yeomanry
    Netheravon School, Abolition of, *July 8*, 1622.
    Pay of Officers transferred to Territorial Force, *July 8*, 1625, 1226.
    Squadron Drill Pay, Abolition of, *July 8*, 1626, 1629.

Lunacy
  Report (1908) Presented, *June 29*, 295, 323.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
  Cloncurry Estate, Situation on, *July 2*, 978.
  Dickson Estate—Disposal of Mulcair Lands, *July 2*, 977.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
  Cider, Proof Spirit in, *June 25*, 64.
  Incest Bill, *Con., June 26*, 287.
  Post Office Vaccination Regulations, *July 3*, 1084.

June 25—July 8.

Luttrell, Mr. H. F. [Devon, Tavistock]
- Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1109, 1112.

Lynch, Mr. H. F. B. [Yorkshire, W.R. Ripon]
- Macedonian Reform Proposals—Tabling of Agreement, *July 2*, 957.
- Persia
  - Regan, Afghan Occupation of, *June 29*, 354.
  - Situation in, *June 25*, 88; *June 30*, 569.
  - Tabling of Papers, *July 7*, 1460.
  - Teheran Legations, Troops Guarding, *June 29*, 356; *July 2*, 956.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
- Germany, Report on Cost of Living in, *July 6*, 1250.
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 593; *July 1*, 794, 819, 823, 841.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Kirkdale]
- Liquor Traffic — Wine and Spirit Merchants' Licences, *July 2*, 985.
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 1*, 847, 854; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1526.

McCartie Estate
- Sale Proposals.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 104.

Macdonald, Mr. J. A. M. [Falkirk Burghs]
- Navy Estimates, Time Allotted to, *June 29*, 343.

Macdonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
- Congo Free State—Protestant Mission Sites, *July 2*, 955.
- Fairfield Shipbuilding Company, Prosecution of, *July 6*, 1240.
- Hollesley Bay, Report on, *July 2*, 970.
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 404–408, 469; *June 30*, 593.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berkshire, Newbury]
- Egypt — Special Tribunal Decree, *June 30*, 567.
- India
  - Mohmand Rising — Issue of Papers, *June 30*, 565.
  - Press Act VII. of 1908.
    - Interpretation of, *June 25*, 78, 79.
    - Report of Debates on, *June 30*, 565.
- Small Holdings Inquiries, Hour for Holding, *June 30*, 581; *July 2*, 970.

McKenna, Rt. Hon. R.—*First Lord of the Admiralty* [Monmouth, N.]
- Aden Guard Ship, *June 25*, 74.
- Admiralty
  - Coal, Expenditure on, *July 6*, 1224.
  - Contracts — Wages paid by Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth and Co., *June 29*, 341, 342.
  - Fires, Loss and Damage by, *June 25*, 72, 73.
- Casualties Return, Continuance of, *June 25*, 74, 75, 76.
- Chatham Dockyard Store—Joiners' work done by Labourers, *July 7*, 1452.
- Coastguard
  - Fife Service, Decision as to, *July 8*, 1650.
  - Summer Manœuvres, Employment in, *June 29*, 342.
- Collisions, Record of, *June 29*, 343, 344.
- "Commonwealth," Cost of Repairs to, *June 25*, 73.
- Crews, Men available for, *July 8*, 1651.
- "Defence" Detention of, *July 8*, 1651.
- Dockyards—Facilities for men to join Territorial Force, *June 25*, 73.
- Education and Training
  - Cadets and Complements of Training Cruisers, *June 26*, 220.
  - Cost to Parents, *July 8*, 1703–1705.
  - Interchangeability System—Inquiry proposed, *July 8*, 1706–1709.
- Engineers—Mechanicians, New Training Scheme, *July 8*, 1705, 1706, 1709, 1710.
- Estimates, Time allotted to, *June 29*, 343.
- Greenwich Hospital Pension Grievances, *July 8*, 1743.
- Hamble River Navigation, *July 7*, 1453, 1454.
- Helmsdale Harbour, State of, *July 8*, 1650.
- Officers, Orders bestowed on, in 1907, *June 29*, 334.
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 672–674.
- Portsmouth Dockyard Medical Arrangements, *June 29*, 333.
- Rosyth Works—Sinking of Cylinder, *July 8*, 1650, 1651.
- Stewards and Cooks, Pension Claims of, *July 7*, 1446.
- "Victoria and Albert" Royal Yacht, Future of, *July 1*, 741.
- Volunteer Reserve, Supply of Kits to, *June 30* 562.

McLaren, Sir C. B. B [Leicester, Bosworth]
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1307–1310.

Maclean, Mr. D. [Bath]
Incest Bill, *Con., June 26*, 282.

Macnamara Dr. T. J.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Camberwell, N.]
Education and Training
Cost to Parents, *July 8*, 1734, 1735.
Interchangeablitity System—Inquiry proposed, *July 8*, 1730–1736.
Engineers—Mechanicians, New Training Scheme, *July 8*, 1737, 1738.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con., June 26*, 249, 263, 273.
Marines—Working of New Training Scheme *July 8*, 1735.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
Bank of Ireland and Government Business, *July 8*, 1677.
Bustard Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 1*, 771.
D'Angely Case, *July 6*, 1247.
National Assurance Company of Ireland—Case of Corrigan *v.* Read, *July 6*, 1211.
Naval Officers, Dissension among, *July 8*, 1652.
Savings Banks — Effect of State-aid, *July 2*, 944.
Teenan's Estate — Sale Proposals, *July 2*, 940.
Uganda Railway — Return as to Expenditure, *July 2*, 944.
Women's Suffrage Movement — Prison Treatment, *July 6*, 1244.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
Banks — Unclaimed Balances
Compulsory Statement proposed, *June 25*, 64.
Estimate of, *June 29*, 357, 358.
Chancery Court, Valuables Lodged with, *July 7*, 1474.
Condition of Ireland — Government Attitude, *June 30*, 585.
Daily Mail Telegrams sent to Members, *July 8*, 1657.
Government Unclaimed Stock — Return proposed, *July 6*, 1238, 1239.
Law Courts — Investment of Irish Funds, *July 7*, 1472, 1473.
Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, *Con., June 26*, 290, 291.
Post Office Savings Bank Unclaimed Balances, Record of, *June 30*, 573, 574.
Post Office Stores Contracts, *July 7*, 1444, 1445; *July 8*, 1633.
School, Roll No. 1950, Circuit 9, Section A., Teaching in, *July 3*, 1086.

Macclesfield and District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill
c. Rep. June 25*, 49.
Con. June 30*, 556.
3R.* *July 3*, 1081.
l. 1R.* *July 6*, 1146.

Macedonia
Reform Proposals — Tabling of Agreement.
Qs. Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 957.

Madagascar
Indentured Labour for the Transvaal.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 2*, 950.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Burnley]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 30*, 646; *July 1*, 840, 842; *Recom., July 6*, 1404.

Madras Landed Estates Bill
Sanction of Indian Government.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 2*, 950.

Maghera
Constabulary Transfers.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 937.

Mall to Charing Cross Improvement
Information as to.
Qs. Mr. W. Rutherford, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. L. Harcourt, *June 30*, 571.

Malt
Importation (1903–1907).
Q. Mr. Barnard; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 3*, 1086.

Man, Isle of
Accounts (1907–1908) Presented, *June 29*, 323.

Manchester Corporation Bill
l. 2R.* *June 29*, 293.

Marble Arch
Coffee Stall, Removal of.
Q. Major Anstruther - Gray; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *June 25*, 55.

Marines, Royal
New Training Scheme, Working of.
Os. Sir J. Herbert, *July 8*, 1726–1728; Dr. Macnamara, 1735.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Nottinghamshire, Mansfield]
Admiralty Expenditure on Coal, *July 6*, 1224.
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R. *July 6*, 1283, 1296–1302.
Motor Speed Limit in London, *July 7*, 1467.

Marks, Mr. G. C. [Cornwall, Launceston]
Naval Interchangeability System — Inquiry proposed, *July 8*, 1728–1730.

Marriage Act (Amendment) Bill
l. 2R. and Bill Withdrawn, *June 30*, 495.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill
c. *Rep.* June 25*, 49.
3R.* *June 26*, 217.
l. 1R.* *June 29*, 294.

Married Women's Property Bill
c. *Con.* July 1*, 899.

Masterman, Mr. C. F. G.—[*Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board*, West Ham, N.]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 235, 240, 243, 244, 246, 254, 259, 265, 268, 270, 277.
Milk Bill, Proposals as to, *June 29*, 363.
Milk Supply—Export of Condensed Skimmed Milk from Certain Countries, *June 25*, 92, 93.
Northumberland—School Site between Westerhope and North Warbottle, *June 29*, 362; *July 2*, 966, 967.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 423–428, 472, 474; *July 1*, 789–794, 817, 833, 868.
Unemployed Officers, Procedure in Dismissing, *June 25*, 91, 92.
Unemployment Statistics for May, *July 2*, 965, 966.

Maybery Estate
Evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 54

Mayo, Earl of
Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 4–9; *Com. July 8*, 1604, 1609.
Land Purchase—Evidence taken before Departmental Committee, *July 2*, 929, 930.
Nurses Registration Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1204.
Proclaimed Counties—Extra Expenditure involved by Disturbances, *July 7*, 1435–1437.

Meagher, Mr. M. [Kilkenny, N.]
Labourers (Ireland) Act—Interpretation of Section 6 (2), *June 25*, 104.

Meat Supply
Beef, Cause for Shortage in.
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 25*, 60.
Inquiry proposed.
Qs. Mr. Bowerman, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 30*, 582.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 8*, 1680.
Railway Charges for Conveyance.
Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *June 25*, 90.

Meath, Earl of
Missing Ships, Board of Trade Inquiry in Cases of, proposed, *July 6*, 1159, 1160.

Meehan, Mr. F. [Leitrim, N.]
Gore-Booth Estate, Sale of, *July 7*, 1450.
West Estate—Case of P. Kelley, *July 7*, 1450.

Meenbanid
Railway Station for.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr Hobhouse, *July 7*, 1444.

Members of Parliament
Colonial Pensions—Return Ordered, *July 7*, 1442.

Menzies, Mr. W. [Lanark, S.]
Fisheries — Public Rights in Scottish Rivers, *July 1*, 770.

Merchant Shipping
Desertions in Foreign Ports 1904–1908—Return proposed.
Os. Bishop of Bangor, *June 29*, 306; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 311; Marquess of Salisbury, 311.
Discipline, Method of Preserving.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *June 29*, 303–305; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 310; Marquess of Salisbury, 313.
Foreign Systems of Pensions, Medical Aid, etc.—Return, Delay in issuing.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *June 29*, 296–305; Lord Ellenborough, 309; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 309; Marquess of Salisbury, 312; Lord Fitzmaurice, 314.
Missing Ships, Board of Trade Inquiry in Cases of, proposed.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 6*, 1149, 1150, 1154, 1155, 1163; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 1155; Marquess of Salisbury, 1157; Earl of Meath, 1159, 1160; Earl of Crewe, 1160–1162; Earl of Halsbury, 1162.
Seamen Discharged—Accommodation on Passage Home.
Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *June 25*, 52.
Sunday Labour, Regulations as to.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *June 29*, 301–303; Bishop of Bangor, 308; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 310.
War Risks, National Guarantee for—Report Presented, *June 26*, 218; *June 29*, 295.

Merthyr Tydfil Corporation Bill
c. *Con.* July 1*, 737.
3R.* *July 6*, 1205.

Metropolitan Commons Provisional Order Bill
l. Rep. July 7*, 1417.
Com. and *Rep.* July 8*, 1593.

Metropolitan District Railway Bill
c. 2R.* *June 29*, 321.
Rep. July 7*, 1439.

Meysey-Thompson, Mr. E. C. [Stafford-shire, Handsworth]
Navy Grog Ration, Allowance in Lieu of, proposed, *July 1*, 748, 749.

Mexico
Trade Report Presented, *July 1*, 730.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 29*, 422; *July 6*, 1354.

Midleton, Viscount
Afghanistan, British Policy in, *June 30*, 538–540.
Bengal, Partition of, *June 30*, 540–543.
Poor Law Reform, Necessity for, *June 25*, 42.
Taxation, Local — Increased Burdens thrown on Rates, etc., *June 25*, 40–44.
Yeomanry Officers Transferred to Territorial Force, Pay of, *July 8*, 1627, 1628.

Mildmay, Mr. F. B. [Devonshire, Totnes]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 30*, 633–636, 655.

Militia
Disbanded Units—Disposal of Officers.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 26*, 221.
Position of Men who have not Enlisted in the Special Reserve.
Os. Duke of Bedford, *July 1*, 734; Lord Loreburn, 735–737.

Milk Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. E. A. Strauss; *A.* Mr. Masterman, *June 29*, 363.

Milk Supply
Skimmed Milk, Condensed—Export from Certain Countries.
Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Masterman, *June 25*, 92.

Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. W. [Lanarkshire, N.W.]
Glasgow Unemployed, Opportunity for Discussion, *July 8*, 1784.
"Highflyer," H.M.S., Repairs to, *July 1*, 746, 747.
Honduras, British—Railway Construction Petition, *July 1*, 753.
Jamaica — Kingston Improvement Proposals, *June 25*, 81.

Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 29*, 468, 471.
Transvaal Mines—Mortality Statistics, *June 29*, 352; *July 1*, 753.
Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 128–137, 163.
Trespass Act of 1865, Application of, *June 25*, 133, 134.

Moate
Cattle-drive, Cruelties Perpetrated during.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 1*, 774.

Molteno, Mr. P. A. [Dumfriesshire]
Suez Canal Revenue—Adjustment of Surplus, *June 29*, 330.
Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 185–187.

Monaghan Estate
Disposal of Untenanted Land.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 102.

Mond, Mr. A. [Chester]
Volunteer Long-Service Medal, Award of, *July 7*, 1455.

Money, Mr. L. G. C. [Paddington, N.]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 30*, 609.

Montagu, Mr. E. S. [Cambridgeshire, Chesterton]
Small Holdings and Allotments Act.
Demand for Small Holdings, Method of Ascertaining, *July 2*, 969.
Expenses, Payment of, *June 30*, 579.
Schemes—Number submitted, *July 2*, 968.

Montenegro
British Representation.
Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Sir. E. Grey, *June 25*, 84.

Mooney Mr. J. J. [Newry]
Cork Corporation Surcharges, *June 30*, 587.
National School Teachers—Grievances of, Transition Teachers, *June 25*, 67.
Newry Extra Police on 21st Inst., *June 29*, 376, 377.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 3*, 1108, 1110, 1112, 1116, 1119, 1120, 1125.

Moore, Mr. W. [Armagh, N.]
Crown Jewels, Loss of, *July 2*, 979.
Crumlin Post Office Charge Clerk, *July 6*, 1209.
Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898—Surplus of Fee Fund, *July 2*, 940.

Moore, Mr. W.—*cont.*
National School Teachers.
Civil Rights of, *July 2*, 1036, 1037.
Salaries, Conditions of granting Increase, *July 2*, 1035, 1038.
Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 290, 291.

Moray Firth
Fisheries, Protection of.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 1*, 770.
Trawling Negotiations.
Os. Sir A. Bignold, *July 8*, 1744–1748; Mr. Williamson, 1748–1751; Major Anstruther-Gray, 1751, 1752. Mr. R. L. Harmsworth, 1753; Mr. A. S. Wilson, 1754; Mr. A. Bryce, 1755; Captain Waring, 1756–1758; Mr. Power, 1758; Mr. Sutherland, 1759–1765; Captain A. Murray, 1765; Mr. Morton, 1766–1769; Sir E. Grey, 1769–1774; Mr. C. E. Price, 1770; Mr. Pirie, 1774; Mr. J. C. Wason, 1775–1777; Mr. M. Ferguson, 1777, 1778; Mr. Weir, 1778–1780; Mr. Sinclair, 1780–1782.
Qs. Mr. Morton, Mr. C. E. Price, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *June 25*, 83.
Q. Mr. Pirie; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 6*, 1258.

Morley Rt. Hon. Viscount—*Secretary of State for India*
Administrative Policy, *June 30*, 529–533.
Afghanistan.
Anglo-Russian Agreement—Attitude of Ameer, *June 30*, 528.
British Policy in, *June 30*, 528.
Papers relating to—Tabling proposed, *June 30*, 555, 556.
Bengal Partition of, *June 30*, 525.
Condition of—Causes of unrest, etc., *June 30*, 523, 529.
Frontier Disturbances, Causes of, etc., *June 30*, 527.
Fuller, Sir Bampfylde—Circumstances of Resignation, *June 30*, 526.

Morocco
Clark Kennedy, Mr., Capture of.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *June 25*, 89.
Postal Facilities—Cash-on-Delivery System.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 2*, 967.

Morpeth, Viscount [Birmingham, S.]
Dividing Societies, Valuation of, *July 7*, 1472.
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1129, 1133.

Morpeth, Viscount—*cont.*
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 246, 249, 257, 270, 274.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 7*, 1553.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1123.

Morrell, Mr. P. [Oxon, Henley]
Bishops Lydeard—Small Holdings Inquiry *June 30*, 579.
Dorchester Small Holdings Inquiries, *June 30*, 577, 578.
Housing, Town Planning, etc., Bill, Proposals as to, *July 6*, 1251.
Small Holdings, Demand for, *June 29*, 369; *July 2*, 969.
Equipment, Provision of, *June 29*, 369.
Inquiries, Hour for Holding, *June 30*, 580, 581.
Refusals, Appeals against, *June 29*, 369.
Schemes
Date for Submitting, *June 29*, 367.
Delay, Prevention of, *June 29*, 371.
Small Holdings and Allotments Act
Administration of, *June 29*, 370.
Expenses, Payment of, *June 30*, 578.
Somerset County Council Small Holdings Committee—Statement by Chairman, *June 30*, 581.
Thames
Conservancy, Powers and Position of, *July 1*, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761; *July 7*, 1465, 1466.
Places Abutting on — List proposed, *June 29*, 333.
Wheatley School Children, Church Attendance of, *July 6*, 1218.
Women's Suffrage Movement — Prison Treatment, *July 6*, 1244.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland]
Army Estimates—Discussion of Vote 12, *July 8*, 1681.
Criminal Procedure — Sentence on R. Simpson, *June 25*, 182.
Embo Pier Improvement, *July 1*, 769.
Fisheries — Opportunity for Discussion, *June 25*, 122.
Helmsdale Harbour, State of, *July 8*, 1649.
Local Government Board, Work of — Delay in effecting Reforms, alleged, *June 25*, 179–182.
Moray Firth
Fisheries, Protection of, *July 1*, 770.
Trawling — Progress of Negotiations, *June 25*, 83; *July 8*, 1766–1769.

[*cont.*

Morton, Mr. A. C.—*cont.*
- Old Shoremore Harbour, Improvement of, *July 1*, 769.
- Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs), Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1091.
- Port Skerra Pier Improvement, *July 1*, 770.
- Supply, Scottish — Opportunity for Discussion, *June 25*, 216.
- Sutherland
  - Education Grant, *July 8*, 1662.
  - Roads, Maintenance of, *July 1*, 769.
- Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 226; *June 26*, 231, 232.
- Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 177, 179, 183.

Motherwell Burgh Extension, etc., Bill
l. 3R.* *July 6*, 1145.

Motors
- Foreign Law and Practice.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1460.
- Omnibus
  - Accidents in April and May.
    - *Q.* Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 2*, 962.
  - Speed in London.
    - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 1*, 756.
- Speed
  - Applications from Local Authorities.
    - *Q.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *July 1*, 756.
  - Limit in London.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Markham, Captain Craig, Mr. H. C. Lea; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 7*, 1467.
- Speedometers, Use of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 1*, 755.
- Taximeter Cabs, *see under* Cabs.

Muldoon, Mr. J. [Wicklow, E.]
- Forestry, Irish—Case of Mr. Ellison, *June 25*, 57.
- Greystones Harbour, Condition of, *June 29*, 378.
- Local Registration of Title (Ireland) Amendment Bill, Date of Proceeding with, *July 2*, 1080.
- Post Office—Irish Mail Conveyance, *June 25*, 111.

Municipal Franchise (Mercantile Corporations and Companies) Bill.
l. 1R.* *June 29*, 295.

Murnaghan, Mr. G. [Tyrone, Mid.]
- Christian Brothers' Schools, Pupils in and Grants to, *July 2*, 1039–1042.
- Old-age Pensions Bill
  - Disqualification under, *July 6*, 1239.
  - Outdoor Relief, Disqualification by. *July 2*, 973.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
- Belfast Schools in Circuit 8, Reports on, *June 29*, 338.
- Education
  - Attendance under Thirty-Five, Cases of, *June 29*, 326.
  - Commission, Constitution of, *July 2*, 1000, 1001.
  - Grant, Additional, Distribution of, *June 26*, 220; *June 29*, 377; *July 2*, 976; *July 6*, 1214.
  - MacMillan, Mr., Reports of, *June 29*, 338.
  - National School Teachers
    - Liquor Licences, Regulations as to Teachers having Connection with, *July 2*, 1001.
    - Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2*, 996–999.
  - Primary, Condition of, *July 2*, 999–1003.
  - Schools—Sanitary Condition and Heating Arrangements, *July 2*, 1001.
  - Training—Applications for One Year's Course, *June 29*, 340.
- Foiladown—Case of J. Healy, *June 29*, 376.
- Irish Universities Bill—Extern Students, *June 29*, 327.
- Knockanes—Case of D. Healy, *June 25*, 104, 105.
- McCartie Estate, Sale Proposals, *June 25*, 104.
- Portarlington School Inspector, *June 29*, 338.

Murray, Captain A. [Kincardineshire]
- Banchory Postal Facilities, *July 6*, 1216.
- Indian Army Medals for Recent Operations, Award of, *June 25*, 79.
- Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to Enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1765.
- Naval Officers, Dissensions among, *July 8*, 1652.

Muscat
- Traffic in Arms.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease. *June 29*, 354.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *June 30*, 569.

Muskerry, Lord
- "Bengore Head," S.S., Causes of Accidents to, in Portsmouth Harbour, *July 1*, 732.
- "Grindon Hall," S.S., Loss of, *July 6*, 1152–1154.

[*cont.*

Muskerry, Lord—*cont.*
- Merchant Shipping
  - Discipline, Method of Preserving, *June 29*, 303–305.
  - Foreign Systems of Pensions, Medical Aid, etc.—Return, *June 29*, 296–305.
  - Missing Ships, Board of Trade Inquiry in Cases of, proposed, *July 6*, 1149, 1150, 1154, 1155, 1163.
  - Sunday Labour, Regulations as to, *June 29*, 301–303.
- "Neptune," S.S., Loss of, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 6*, 1149, 1151, 1163.

Myer, Mr. H. [Lambeth, N.]
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 668.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
- Alcohol, Industrial Use of — Conditions of authorising, *July 2*, 972, 973.
- Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 243, 248, 255, 276.

Natal
- Dinizulu, Trial of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Alden; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 25*, 80.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nicholls; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 30*, 565.

National Assurance Company of Ireland
- Case of Corrigan *v.* Read.
  - *Q.* Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 6*, 1211.

National Debt
- Sinking Fund Reduction Proposals.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 6*, 1211.

National Military Training Bill
- c. Order for Second Reading and Bill withdrawn, *June 25*, 213.

National Military Training (No. 2) Bill
- c. *Intro.*, *July 7*, 1481.

Naval Volunteers (Lands) Bill
- Facilities for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 2*, 946.

Navigation Works (Ireland) Bill
- c. Order for Second Reading and Bill withdrawn, *July 6*, 1415.

Navy
- *First Lord*—Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.
- *Financial Secretary* — Dr. T. J. Macnamara.
- Casualties Return, Continuance of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley, Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Bowles, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *June 25*, 74.

Navy—*cont.*
- Chatham Dockyard Store — Joiners' Work done by Labourers.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 7*, 1452.
- Coastguards, *see that title.*
- Collisions, Record of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley; Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *June 29*, 343.
- "Commonwealth," Cost of Repairs to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *June 25*, 73.
- Crews, Men available for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 8*, 1651.
- "Defence," Cause for Detention of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 8*, 1651.
- Dockyards—Facilities for Men to join Territorial Force.
  - *Qs.* Sir S. Scott, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *June 25*, 73.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 1*, 749.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1226.
- Education and Training
  - Cadets and Complements of Training Cruisers.
    - *Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *June 26*, 220.
  - Cost to Parents.
    - *Os.* Mr. Barnes, *July 8*, 1687; Mr. Bellairs, 1701; Mr. McKenna, 1703–1705; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1718; Dr. Macnamara, 1734, 1735.
  - Interchangeability System, Inquiry into, proposed.
    - *Os.* Mr. Barnes, *July 8*, 1684–1686, 1690; Mr. Bellairs, 1695–1703; Mr. McKenna, 1706–1709; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1716–1720; Mr. Beauchamp, 1723, 1724; Sir J. Herbert, 1724–1728; Mr. C. Marks, 1728–1730; Dr. Macnamara, 1730–1736. Mr. A. Lee, 1738.
  - Engineer Mechanicians — Drawbacks of New Training Scheme.
    - *Os.* Mr. Barnes, *July 8*, 1688–1694, 1705; Mr. McKenna, 1705, 1706, 1709, 1710; Mr. C. Duncan, 1712, 1716, 1721; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1720–1723; Dr. Macnamara, 1737, 1738; Mr. R. Duncan, 1739, 1740.
  - Grog Ration, Allowance in Lieu of, proposed.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Meysey-Thompson, Major Anstruther - Gray; *As.* Mr. Lambert, Mr. Speaker, *July 1*, 748.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
"Highflyer," Repairs to.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Lambert, Mr. Speaker, *July 1*, 746.
"Irresistible"—Report on Flooding of Engine-Room.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Lambert, *July 1*, 748.
Marines, Royal, *see that title.*
Officers, Orders bestowed on, in 1907.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *June 29*, 333.
Osborne, *see that title.*
Portsmouth Dockyard Medical Arrangements.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *June 29*, 333.
Prize Money, etc.—Accounts Presented, *July 6*, 1208.
Rosyth Works—Sinking of Cylinder.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 8*, 1650.
Stewards and Cooks, Pension Claims of
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 7*, 1446.
Volunteer Reserve, Supply of Kits to.
Q. Mr. G. D. Faber; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *June 30*, 562.

Navy Estimates
Civil Pensions and Gratuities—£377,400, *Com.* July 8*, 1743.
Educational Services—£176,000, *Com.*, *July 8*, 1683.
Half Pay and Retired Pay—£868,800, *Com.* July 8*, 1743.
Pensions, Gratuities and Compassionate Allowances—£1,334,600, *Com.*, *July 8*, 1741.
Time allotted to.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 25*, 74.
Qs. Mr. Ashley, Mr. Bellairs, Mr. J. M. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *June 29*, 343.
Qs. Mr. Ashley, Mr. James Hope; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 1*, 747.
Vote 5, Discussion of.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Barnes; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 1*, 776.

"Neptune," S.S.
Loss of, Inquiry into, Proposed.
Qs. Lord Muskerry, *July 6*, 1149, 1151, 1163; Lord Hamilton of Dalzell, 1156.

New Writs
See under Parliamentary Elections.

New Zealand
Shop Hours Acts—Report Presented, *July 1*, 731, 739.
Wages Boards, etc.—Report Presented, *July 1*, 731, 739.

Newry
Extra Police on 21st inst.
Q. Mr. Mooney; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 376.

Nicholls, Mr. G. [Northants, N.]
Natal—Trial of Dinizulu, *June 30*, 565.

Nield, Mr. H. [Middlesex, Ealing]
Bechuanaland Expedition, Medal for, *June 25*, 71.
National Debt—Reduction of Sinking Fund, *July 6*, 1211.
Navy
Crews, Men available for, *July 8*, 1651.
"Defence," Detention of, *July 8*, 1651.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *June 29*, 455. *Con.*, *July 6*, 1358.

Nigeria
Northern—Prevention of Spirit Smuggling.
Q. Sir J. Kennaway. *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 29*, 351.
Southern
Fines Paid in Gin.
Q. Sir J. Kennaway; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 29*, 350.
Land Alienation.
Qs. Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 2*, 951.
Spirit Traffic, Control of.
Q. Sir J. Kennaway; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 29*, 350.

Nolan Estate
Cattle-Drives.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 98.

North British and Mercantile Insurance Company Bill
c. Rep. June 25*, 49.
Con. June 30*, 556.
3R.* *July 3*, 1081.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 6*, 1146.

North-East London Railway Bill
l. 3R.* *June 25*, 2.

Northern Assurance Company Bill
c. 2R.* *June 29*, 321.
Rep. July 7*, 1439.

Northumberland
School Site between Westerhope and North Warbottle.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Masterman, *June 29*, 362.
Qs. Mr. J. D. White, Mr. Wedgwood, Mr. Cox; *As.* Mr. Masterman, *July 2*, 966.

Norway
Seamen, Distressed, Relief of—Notes Presented, *July 6*, 1147, 1208.

Notification of Births Act
Persons Responsible for Notification.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Burns, *June 29*, 331.
Towns adopting.
Q. Mr. Sherwell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 7*, 1447.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill
c. Bill withdrawn, *July 2*, 931.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways (No. 2) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 7*, 1439.

Nurses Registration Bill
l. 2R., *July 6*, 1188.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
Strawberries—Price charged by Kitchen Committee, *June 29*, 371, 372.

O'Brien, Mr. W. [Cork]
Cork Corporation Surcharges, *June 30*, 587.
Land Purchase Annuities Collectable, *June 30*, 561; *July 8*, 1637, 1666.

O'Connell Estate
Tenants, Position of.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 8*, 1646.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare]
National School Teachers' Salary, Increase, Conditions of granting, *July 2*, 1018–1024.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 7*, 1491.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
National School Teachers' Salary, Increase, Conditions of granting, *July 2*, 1078.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
Education
Higher, Assistance to, *July 6*, 1219.
National School Teachers—University Lecture Courses, *July 6*, 1222.
Scholarships, etc., Grants for, *July 6*, 1221.
Post Office Mail Conveyance, Railway Charge for, *July 2*, 934.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
Armagh—Boycott of M. McDermott, *June 25*, 110.
Griffith Estate, Sale Proposals, *June 30*, 587.
National School Teachers' Salary, Increase, Conditions of granting, *July 2*, 1079.
Persia, Martial Law in, *July 2*, 954.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
Franco-British Exhibition—Indian Subsidy and Exhibits, *June 30*, 563, 564.
India—Statement published in *Eastern Bengal and Assam Era*, *June 30*, 564.

O'Kelly, Mr. C. [Mayo, N.]
Claremount Estate, Disposal of, *July 6*, 1222.
Congested Districts Board Expenditure on Wages, *July 6*, 1213.
Robe River Drainage, *July 6*, 1213.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]
Tredennick Estate Evicted Tenants, *July 6*, 1212.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
Clouncon—Case of J. Kenny, *July 8*, 1649.
Croughteeri—Case of J. Murphy, *June 29*, 341; *July 8*, 1675, 1676.
Delmege Estate, Sale Proposals, *June 25*, 110.
Glenakill, South—Case of Mrs. J. Guiney, *July 2*, 937.

Old-Age Pensions Bill
c. *Com.*, *June 29*, 381; *June 30*, 591; *July 1*, 780.
*Rep.** *July 1*, 899; *July 6*, 1415.
Con., *July 6*, 1343; *July 7*, 1489.
Recom., *July 6*, 1379.
Clause 3 (b), Males likely to be disqualified under.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 29*, 359.
Clauses 8 and 9, Voting separately on.
Os. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. Chairman, *July 1*, 874.
Cost of Scheme.
Q. Sir J. Randles; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 6*, 1239.
Debates in Committee (Commons), *June 29* 381; *June 30*, 591; *July 1*, 780; Consideration, *July 6*, 1343; *July 7*, 1489; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1379.
Age Limit
Lowering to Sixty-five, proposed, 1545–1551.
Method of verifying Ages of Recipients, 1514–1526.
Amendments, Cost of, 616, 649, 650, 655.
Appeal to Local Government Board, 798, 823, 850–852, 862–864, 866–870.
British-born Subjects confining Benefits to, proposed, 1360.
Claimant, Right of Appeal from Decision of Pension Committee, 857–861.
Clause 3, Recommitment of, proposed, 1363–1372.

[*cont.*

Old-Age Pensions Bill—*cont.*

Debates in Committee (Commons)—*cont.*

- Continuance of until 1910, proposed, 426, 434.
- Cost of, 422.
- "Dependent"—Definition of Term, 1381.
- Five Shillings a Week as Limit, proposed, 1507, 1511–1514.
- Funds, Provision of, 400.
- Gambling, Drunkenness, etc., as a Disqualification, 1554–1562.
- Government Amendments, 1551, 1581, 1587, 1588, 1591.
- High Court, Appeal to, proposed, 847–854.
- Income, Calculation of
  - Benefits and Privileges, Method of reckoning, 613–628, 1379–1381.
  - Definition of, 592–606, 681, 682.
  - Friendly Society or Trade Union Allowances up to £40, Exemption of, proposed, 633–655.
  - Insurance Premiums, Decision as to, 593–598, 671–681.
  - Naval and Military Pensions not exceeding £26 5s., Exclusion of, proposed, 659–668.
  - "Net" Income, proposed, 591–606.
  - Not to exceed £31 10s., 1539.
  - Property capable of Profitable Investment, Reckoning of, 686–692, 1574–1578.
  - "Receivable"—Insertion of word in lieu of "payable," 685.
  - Sliding Scale proposed, 1344, 1350, 1382–1408.
  - Unearned Income only to be reckoned, proposed, 609–613.
- Industry or Character Test—Men belonging to Benefit Societies for Ten Years previously, Exemption of, 1565–1571.
- Pension Agents, Safeguarding against, 1489–1502.
- Pension Committees
  - Discretionary Powers of, 474–476, 622, 623.
  - Evidence of Claimant, Provision for hearing, 844–847.
  - Functions of, 785–789, 791, 794, 800, 808, 816, 823.
  - Inquiries, Procedure as to, 812–819, 1497, 1502.
  - Inquiries Independently of Pension Officers, Provision for, 841–843.

Old-Age Pensions Bill—*cont.*

Debates in Committee (Commons)—*cont.*

- Pension Officer
  - Appointment, Regulations governing, 807, 809, 811, 814, 821.
  - Assistants, Appointment of, proposed, 836–841.
  - Duties of, 785, 800–806, 810.
  - Report, Decision as to Publication of, 794, 823.
  - Substitution for Pension Committee, proposed, 781–784, 792, 795–799, 824.
- Poor Law Disqualification
  - Continuance of only until 1910, proposed, 1539–1548.
  - Definition of, 381, 472, 473, 1551–1553.
  - Exceptions—Government Proposals, 461–470, 1551.
  - Medical Relief, Position of Persons in Receipt of, 462–470.
  - Outdoor Relief, Exemption of Persons in Receipt of, proposed, 383–436.
  - "Owing to Improvidence," Restricting to Cases of, proposed, 443–458.
- Recipient to Prove that during Three Years Previous to Attaining Age of 70, he had worked for not less than 126 Weeks and Income had not exceeded 20s. a Week, proposed, 1507–1511, 1513, 1514.
- Recommitment of Bill, Proposals for, 470, 1343, 1360.
- Schedules
  - New Schedule, 895.
  - Objections to, 1411, 1412.
  - Sliding Scales suggested, 1382–1408.
- Seamen—Residence to include Service on a Vessel registered in the United Kingdom, proposed, 1526–1536.
- Soldiers, Inclusion of, 1528, 1530.
- Stipendiary Magistrate, or County Court Judge in Lieu of Pension Committee, proposed, 799, 811, 824–834.
- Thrift, Effect on, 633, 641, 1391, 1394, 1397.
- Women, Inclusion of, 1562–1565.

Division—Doors in "No" Lobby locked while Members were still entering. "Aye" Lobby, Validity of Division. *Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, Mr. A. J. Balfour, *June 30*, 698; Mr. Chairman, 698, 699.

Friendly Societies Thrift Certificates. *Q.* Mr. Wiles; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 2*, 944.

[*cont.*

Old-Age Pensions Bill—*cont.*

Government Amendments of which Notice had not been given, Propriety of Closuring.

Os. Mr. Bowles, *June 30*, 697, 709; Mr. Chairman, Mr. A. Chamberlain, 697, 698; Mr. Speaker, 709.

Naval and Military Service, Provisions as to.

Qs. Captain Faber; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 1*, 744, 754.

Pension Committee, Appointment of.

Q. Mr. B. S. Straus; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 6*, 1219.

Pension Officers, Selection of.

Q. Mr. Brooke. *A.* Mr. Lloyd-Geoge, *July 7*, 1448.

Poor Law Relief Disqualification.

Q. Mr. Murnaghan; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 2*, 973.

Qs. Mr. Murnaghan; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Speaker, *July 6*, 1239

Q. Mr. W. T. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 7*, 1449.

Proposals as to.

Q. Mr. W. R. Rea; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 2*, 985.

Old Shoremore Harbour

Improvement of.

Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 1*, 769.

Omnibuses

Motor, *see under* Motors.

Number in London.

Q. Mr. J. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 2*, 934.

Onslow, Earl of—*Chairman of Committees*

Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, *Com.*, *July 8*, 1610, 1611.

Horse Breeding, Government Action, Necessity for, *July 6*, 1178.

Taxation Local—Increased burdens thrown on Urban and Rural Rates, etc., *June 25*, 47.

Opium

Indo-Chinese trade—Restriction of Poppy Cultivation.

Q. Mr. T. Taylor; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 25*, 77.

Ordnance Survey

Report Presented, *July 8*, 1595, 1632.

Orkney

Bay of Firth Oyster Beds.

Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. J. D. White; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 29*, 372.

Qs. Mr. J. D. White; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 1*, 741, 765.

Osborne College

Cost of.

Os. Mr. Barnes, *July 8*, 1686.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill

l. 3R.* *June 25*, 3.

c. 1R.* *June 29*, 322.

2R.* *June 30*, 557.

Con. June 2*, 931.

3R.* *July 6*, 1205.

Parker, Mr. J. [Halifax]

Post Office—Hours of Clerks in Savings Banks and Engineer-in-Chief's Office, *July 3*, 1083.

Parkes, Mr. E. [Birmingham, Central]

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1290–1296.

Parliament

House of Commons

Committees, *see that title.*

Police Duties.

Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *June 29*, 364.

Strawberries — Price charged by Kitchen Committee.

Qs. Mr. P. O'Brien; *As.* Sir J. Jacoby, *June 29*, 371.

House of Lords—Representative Peers for Ireland, Viscount Boyne, *July 6*, 1145; *July 9*, 1417.

Parliamentary Elections

New Writs issued

Pembroke, County of, *July 1*, 780.

Parliamentary Procedure

Speeches, Duration of.

Q. Mr. Cleland; Mr. Asquith, *June 29*, 379.

Teller receiving Bows of Members without removing his own Hat.

Os. Sir B. Gurdon, Mr. Chairman, *July 1*, 893.

Votes and Proceedings, Form of.

Qs. Mr. W. Rutherford; *As.* Mr. Speaker, *July 1*, 777.

Parliamentary Reform

Legislative Proposals.

Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 2*, 985.

Q. Mr. Rees; Mr. Asquith, *July 8*, 1679.

Patents Act, 1907

Section 27, Working of.

Qs. Mr. T. Davies, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 1*, 763.

Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 2*, 965.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]

Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 681; *July 1*, 854.

Welsh Church Commission Report, Date of issuing, *June 29*, 360.

Pease, Mr. J. A.—*Lord of the Treasury* [Essex, Saffron Walden]
"Arcadia"—Capture within German Territorial Limit, *June 29*, 355.
French, Tariff Commission, *July 6*, 1238.
Glasgow Unemployed—Opportunity for Discussion, *July 8*, 1784.
Muscat—Traffic in Arms, *June 29*, 354.
Persia
  Regan, Afghan Occupation of, *June 29*, 354.
  Troops guarding Teheran Legations, *June 29*, 356.
Persian Gulf Gun-running, *June 29*, 354.
Scottish Supply—Opportunity for Discussion, *June 25, 216.*
Sugar, Brussels Convention—Statement by Sir H. Bergne, *June 29*, 356.
United States Tax on British Travellers, *July 6*, 1238.

Persia.
Martial Law in.
  Q. Mr. O'Dowd; Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 954.
Papers, Tabling of.
  Qs. Mr. Dillon. Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1460.
Regan, Afghan Occupation of.
  Qs. Mr. Hart-Davies, Mr. Lynch; *As.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *June 29*, 354.
Situation in.
  Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *June 25, 87.*
  Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Lynch; *As.* Sir E. Grey, Mr. Speaker, *June 30*, 685.
Tabriz, Situation in.
  Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 954.
Teheran Legations—Troops guarding.
  Qs. Mr. Lynch; *As.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *June 29*, 356.
  Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; A. Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 953.
  Qs. Mr. Lynch, Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 956.
  British Legation—Persian Troops surrounding.
    Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 957.
    Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1460.
  Payment of Cost of.
    Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. A. Lee. *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 2*, 950.

Persian Gulf
Gun-running.
  Q. Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *June 29*, 354.

Pharmacy (Ireland) Acts
Order in Council Presented, *July 7*, 1418, 1441.

Philips, Mr. J. [Longford, S.]
Longford Evicted Tenants, *July 6*, 1220.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
l. Rep. June 30*, 493.
Com. July 1*, 729.
Rep. July 2*, 901.
3R.* *July 6*, 1147.
c. 1R.* *July 6*, 1206.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (Bridgwater Order) (No. 1) Bill
l. Report from the Select Committee, *June 30*, 493.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
l. Rep. June 25*, 3.
3R.* *June 29*, 294.
c. 1R.* *June 29*, 322.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *June 29*, 293.
Com. July 1*, 730.
Rep. July 2*, 901.
3R.* *July 6*, 1147.
c. 1R.* *July 6*, 1207.

Pilots and Pilotage
Clyde Pilot, charge against.
  Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 29*, 374.
  Qs. Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 6*, 1257.
United Kingdom Pilots Association, Deputation of.
  Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *June 25*, 90.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]
Fisheries, Scottish, Opportunity for Discussion, *June 25*, 121, 123, 126.
Indian Army—Disposition of Scottish Regiments, *July 8*, 1655.
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to enforcing Three-mile Limit, etc., *July 6*, 1258; *July 8*, 1774.
Secretary of State for Scotland—Position, and work of Office, *June 25*, 119–122.
Scottish Supply—Opportunity for Discussion, *June 25*, 123, 126, 215; *July 8*, 1663, 1664.
Woodside Postal Facilities, *July 8*, 1657.

Police
Annual Holiday.
  Q. Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 1*, 755.
Brighton Convalescent Home, Conditions of entering.
  Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 8*, 1632.

[*cont.*

Police—*cont.*
Constables raised from the Ranks.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 2*, 963.
D'Angely Case, *see that title.*
Metropolitan
Duty during Visit of French President, Pay for.
Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 6*, 1240.
Good Conduct Stripes.
Q. Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *June 29*, 360.

Police County Authorities Bill
c. 1R.* *June 25*, 116.

Police Superannuation Bill
*c. Con.** *July 3*, 1101.
l. 1R.* *July 6*, 1149.

Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill
c. Con., *July 3*, 1090.
3R.* *July 3*, 1101.
l. 1R.* *July 6*, 1149.

Polling Districts and Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill
c. Con., *June 26*, 290.
3R.* *July 3*, 1144.
l. 1R.* *July 6*, 1149.

Polling Districts (County Councils) Bill
*c. Con.** *June 26*, 291.
3R.* *July 3*, 1089.
l. 1R.* *July 6*, 1149.

Pondicherry and Karikal
Trade Report Presented, *June 25*, 3.

Poor Law
Ireland
Paupers—Deportation System.
Qs. Mr. Devlin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 980, 981.
Reform proposals.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 982.
Reform, Necessity for.
Os. Viscount Wolverhampton, *June 25*, 29; Viscount Midleton, 42.
Royal Commission Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 6*, 1260.
Union Buildings, Loans for Extending.
Q. Mr. T. R. Bethell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 1*, 745.

Population
Statistics.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 3*, 1082.

Port Skerra
Pier improvement.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 1*, 770.

Portarlington
School Inspector.
Q. Mr. J. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 338.

Post Office
Postmaster-General—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.
[*See also Names of Places.*]
Boy Clerks, Conditions of Employing.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 6*, 1255.
Classification of certain Offices.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 2*, 942.
Engineer-in-Chief's Office—Hours of Clerks.
Q. Mr. J. Parker; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 3*, 1083.
Irish Mail Conveyance.
Q. Mr. Muldoon; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *June 25*, 111.
Linesmen, Promotion of.
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 3*, 1083.
Mail Conveyance, Railway charge for.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 2*, 934.
Medical Attendance of Employees.
Q. Mr. Wiles; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *June 30*, 573.
Postmasters, Sub-, Remuneration of.
Q. Mr. Hudson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *June 30*, 574.
Railway Facilities for Employees on Early Duty.
Qs. Mr. Wardle; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *June 25*, 94.
Stores—Contracts placed in Ireland.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 7*, 1445; *July 8*, 1633.
Substitutes during Camp Training, Provision of.
Q. Mr. Gretton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *June 25*, 93.
Territorial Training Leave for Officials.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6*, 1217.
Vaccination Regulations.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 3*, 1084.
Wages and Conditions of Service—Copies of Circulars announcing Changes ordered, *June 26*, 218; Presented, *July 2*, 932.

Post Office Savings Banks
Accounts Presented, *July 6*, 1148, 1208.
Assistant Clerks, Hours of.
Q. Mr. J. Parker; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 3*, 1083.

[*cont.*

Post Office Savings Banks—*cont.*
Deposits (1903–7).
Q. Mr. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 7*, 1469.
Unclaimed Balances, Record of.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Buxton, Mr. Speaker, *June 30*, 573.

Post Office (Consolidation) Bill
Joint Committee, *June 25*, 214; *June 29*, 294; *July 1*, 731, 738; *July 2*, 987; *July 6*, 1148.

Post Office Sites Bill
l. Rep. July 7*, 1419.
Com. July 8*, 1595.

Postmaster-General
Assistance to, by Lord Granard, etc.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 25*, 113.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 239, 264, 266.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Education
Agriculture, Instruction in, proposed, *July 2*, 1027.
National School Teachers' Salaries—Conditions of Granting Increase, *July 2*, 1025.
Schools
Amalgamation proposals, *July 2*, 1025, 1028.
Sanitary Condition and Heating Arrangements, *July 2*, 1026.
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to Enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1758.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington

President of the Board of Education
Rt. Hon. W. Runciman

President of the Local Government Board
Rt. Hon. J. Burns

President of the Board of Trade
Rt. Hon. W. S. Churchill

Price, Mr. C. E. [Edinburgh, Central]
Glasgow Unemployed, Opportunity for Discussion, *July 8*, 1783.
Indian Army—Disposition of Scottish Regiments, *July 8*, 1656.
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to Enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *June 25*, 84; *July 8*, 1770.
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 433.
Supply, Scottish—Opportunity for Discussion, *June 25*, 216.

Provincial Homes Investment Company, Ltd.
Operations of.
Q. Mr. Scott; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 1*, 746.

Public Health (Sewers and Drains) (No. 2) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 7*, 1481.

Public Offices Sites (Extension) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 6*, 1147.

Public Petitions Committee
Report Presented, *July 1*, 779.

Public Records
Papers of not Sufficient Value to justify Preservation—Copy Presented, *July 1*, 740; *July 2*, 902.

Public Trustee.
Commission returned by Stockbrokers.
Qs. Mr. Ridsdale; *As.* Sir W. Robson, *July 6*, 1256.

Public Works Loan Board
Report Presented, *June 30*, 495, 558.

Questions
Irrelevant, *July 1*, 756; *July 8*, 1657.
Matter of Argument, *July 6*, 1239.
Matter of Opinion, *June 29*, 359; *June 30*, 574.
Notice to be given of, *July 1*, 747, 761; *July 2*, 960.
Out of Order, *June 25*, 76, 95; *July 1*, 768.
Quotations in, *June 30*, 579.
Speech may not be made during Time for, *July 1*, 749.
Yesterday's Unanswered Question, Repetition of, *June 30*, 569.

Radford, Mr. G. H. [Islington, E.]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 268.

Railways
Bicycles, Conveyance of.
Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 6*, 1247.
Conference, Position as to.
Q. Mr. Wardle; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *June 29*, 362.
District Company — Complaints against Carriage Doors.
Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *June 25*, 90.

Randles, Sir J. S. [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 604–606; *Con.*, *July 6*, 1354.
Cost of Scheme, *July 6*, 1239.
Unemployed Grants, *July 6*, 1260.

Rates
Compounding System, Evils of.
Os. Lord Stanley of Alderley, *June 25*, 35; Lord Zouche of Haryngworth, 39.

Rathdowney
Disturbance on 20th inst.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 328.

Rathruddy
Outrage at House of M. Glynn.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 108.

Ravensthorpe Urban District Council Bill
c. 2R.* *June 29*, 321.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P. [Cambridge University]
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con. July 3*, 1138, 1139.
Incest Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 278, 286, 289.
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1101, 1105.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 239, 250–252.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 3R., *June 30*, 709–712.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 618, 628, 680; *July 7*, 1577.
Polling arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1096.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con. July 3*, 1124.
Training Colleges, Secondary, Position of, *June 29*, 326.

Rea, Mr. W. R. [Scarborough]
Half-timers, employment of—proposals for Committee of Inquiry, *June 30*, 576.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *June 29*, 382, 465, 466; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1399.
Proposals as to, *July 2*, 985.

Reask
Cattle-drives on 26th ult.
Q. Sir G. Fardell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 335.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
Clare, State of, *July 8*, 1671, 1672.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
Australian Naval Defence Scheme, *July 2*, 946, 947.
Birthday Honours—Rosette to be worn by Recipients, proposed, *June 29*, 380.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 7*, 1480.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K.—*cont.*
Education
National School Teachers' Salaries—Conditions of Granting increase, *July 2*, 1008–1012.
Schools—Sanitary Condition and Heating Arrangements, *July 2*, 1012, 1013; *July 8*, 1668.
Greystone Harbour, Conditions of, *June 29*, 378.
Inchiquin Estate, Sale Proposals, *July 2*, 978.
Kilmurray Meeting, Police Presence at, *July 6*, 1213.
Motor Omnibus Speed in London, *July 1*, 756.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 644; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1528, 1532.
Tobacco Cultivation, Assistance to, *July 7*, 1463, 1464.
Women Suffragists, Prison Treatment of, *July 1*, 757; *July 2*, 960; *July 6*, 1243.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
Ancient Monuments—Welsh Commission, *July 8*, 1680.
Arms Conference, Scope of, *July 8*, 1639.
Arms, discarded, Disposal of, *July 2*, 956.
Cirencester Royal Agricultural Students, Medals worn by, *June 25*, 76.
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con*, *July 3*, 1135.
Incest Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 284.
India
Assam—Bengal Railway, Thefts on, *July 2*, 949.
Bengal, Partition of—Local opinion, *June 29*, 348.
Budget, Date of Taking, *July 7*, 1444.
Calcutta
Assassination of Constable, *June 30*, 559.
Scottish Mission Church Steps, Bomb found on, *June 30*, 563.
Chittagong Jetty Fires, *July 2*, 949.
Press Act VII. of 1908, Interpretation of, *June 25*, 78.
Thakur Bahadur Singh and Thakur Ram Singh, Cases of, *July 1*, 752.
Lewis, Island of—Sanitary Condition, *July 1*, 767.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 262, 264.
Madras Landed Estates Bill, Sanction of Indian Government, *July 2*, 950.
Muscat Arms, Traffic in, *June 30*, 569, 570.

[*cont.*

Rees, Mr. J. D.—*cont.*
Navy—"Highflyer," Repairs to, *July 1*, 747.
Parliamentary Electoral Reform Proposals, *July 8*, 1679.
Patents and Designs Act, 1907, Section 27, Representations in respect of, *July 2*, 965.
Post Office, Classification of certain Offices, *July 2*, 942.
Russian Tea Duties—Revision Proposals, *July 2*, 954.
St. Bride School Children at Otter Hunt, *July 6*, 1254.
Salonika, State of, *June 30*, 567.
Sugar Cane—Production Statistics, *June 25*, 76.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1122.
Telephone Service Mouthpieces, Microbes in, *June 30*, 576.
Tibet—Roads from India, Grant for Improving, *July 2*, 949, 950.
Wales
  Church Disestablishment—Legislative Proposals, *June 28*, 361.
  Universities, Grants to, *July 2*, 943.
War Office Contracts for Cloth, *July 8*, 1653, 1654.
  Tartan Cloth—Place of Manufacture, *July 2*, 948.
Westminster Church Army March on 4th April, *July 6*, 1242.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools
Records, Form of.
  Q. Sir. W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 8*, 1637.

Regent Circus
Flower Girls.
  Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 1*, 755.

Reinforced Concrete
See Ferro-Concrete.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 6*, 1356.
Police Duty during visit of French President, Pay for, *July 6*, 1240.

Rendell, Mr. A. [Gloucester, Thornbury]
D'Angely Case—Press attacks on Police *July 8*, 1656.
Small Holdings and Allotments Act.
  Area permitted to be acquired, *July 2*, 971.
  Co-operative Societies' Profits, *July 2*, 971.

Renton, Major L. [Lincs., Gainsborough]
Army
  Infantry of the Line, Reduction of, *July 6*, 1233.
  Special Reserve, Transfers to, *July 6*, 1232.
Coroner of South-Western District, Allegations against, *July 6*, 1257.
Women's Suffrage Movement—Cost of Police employed on 30th ult., *July 2*, 961.

Revenue and Expenditure
Gross Income and Outgo — Return ordered, *June 25*, 52.
Returns presented, *July 7*, 1441.
Tax Revenue.
  Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 2*, 935.
  Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 2*, 973.

Rhodesia
Asiatic Registration Act.
  Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 29*, 353.

Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water Bill
*l. Rep.** *June 30*, 493.
  3R.* *July 8*, 1593.

Ribblesdale, Lord
Horses
  Breeding—Necessity for Government Action, *July 6*, 1169–1172.
  Census of all available Horses in Great Britain and Ireland, proposed, *July 6*, 1182.

Richards, Mr. T. F. [Wolverhampton, W.]
Ayr Prison — Complaint by Warder, *July 1*, 743.
London University, Position of, *June 29*, 364.
Portsmouth Dockyard Medical Arrangements, *June 29*, 333.

Richardson, Mr. A. [Nottingham, S.]
Bankruptcy — Case of G. H. Taylor, *July 1*, 762.

Ridsdale, Mr. E. A. [Brighton]
Public Trustee — Commissions returned by Stockbrokers, *July 6*, 1256, 1257.
Reinforced Concrete, Use of Coal Residues, *July 1*, 741

Roads
Main, Cost of Upkeep.
  Os. Lord Belper, *June 25*, 30; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 38.

[*cont.*

Roads—*cont.*
  Maintenance — Expenditure necessitated by heavy Motor Traffic.
    Q. Sir F. Cawley; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 7*, 1466.
  Scottish—*see* Scotland Roads and Bridges.

Robe River
  Drainage Proposals.
    Q. Mr. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 6*, 1213.

Roberts, Mr. C. [Lincoln]
  Liquor Traffic — Dominoes, etc., in Public-Houses, *June 29*, 361.
  Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1121, 1124.
  United States — Liquor Licence Duties, *July 2*, 958.
  Westminster Church Army March on 4th April, *July 6*, 1242.

Roberts, Mr. G. H. [Norwich]
  Local Authorities Accounts, Audit of, *July 7*, 1467.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 434–436; *July 1*, 861.
  Vickers, Sons and Maxim, Messrs.—Indentures of Apprentices, *June 30*, 589.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
  Calcutta — Model Liquor Shops Scheme, *June 25*, 77.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 387–389; *July 1*, 811.

Robertson, Lord
  Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *June 25*, 14–16.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
  Egypt
    Administrators Absent on Leave, *July 7*, 1459.
    Cairo Drainage Scheme, *July 7*, 1459.
  Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1402.
  Southampton Territorial Force Association Poster, *July 6*, 1224.

Robson, Sir W. S.—*Attorney-General* [South Shields]
  Coroner of South-Western District, Allegations against, *July 6*, 1257.
  Limerick Competitions, Legality of, *June 25*, 59.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 421; *June 30*, 619, 627, 628; *July 1*, 835; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1381; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1516, 1528, 1571.

Robson, Sir W. S.—*cont.*
  Public Trustee—Commissions returned by Stockbrokers, *July 6*, 1256, 1257.
  Unclaimed Property, compulsory disclosure, proposed, *June 25*, 59.

Rochester Bridge Bill
  c. *Rep.* July 2*, 932.
    Con. July 8*, 1630.

Rockfield
  Case of J. Burke.
    Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 103.

Roe, Sir T. [Derby]
  Local Authorities, Loans, Regulations as to, *June 30*, 559.

Rogers, Mr. F. N. [Wiltshire, Devizes]
  Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 450.

Ronaldshay, Lord [Middlesex, Hornsey]
  Butter, Nut, Description of, *July 8*, 1659.
  French Tariff Proposals, *July 8*, 1658.
  Germany
    Report on Cost of Living in, *July 6*, 1247.
    Savings Bank Deposits, *July 6*, 1248.
  Volunteer Long Service Medal, *July 6*, 1225.

Rosyth Naval Base
  See under Navy.

Rowlands, Mr. J. [Kent, Dartford]
  Erith Unemployed Grant, *July 7*, 1469.

Runciman, Rt. Hon. W.—*President of the Board of Education* [Dewsbury]
  Code, Date of Circulating, *June 29*, 366.
  Half-timers, Employment of—Proposals for Committee of Inquiry, *June 30*, 576; *July 7*, 1470, 1471.
  London University, Position of, *June 29*, 364, 365.
  Medical Inspection of Children, Grant for, *July 2*, 968; *July 6*, 1252, 1253.
  St. Bride School Children at Otter-hunt, *July 6*, 1254.
  Secondary School Grants (1907–8), *June 30*, 577.
  Southampton—Recognition of St. Anne's School, *June 29*, 366.
  Teachers' Preliminary Examination Results, *July 8*, 1641.
  Training Colleges
    Admission Regulations, *June 29*, 325.
    Secondary, Position of, *June 29*, 326.
  Waivers—Applications Received in 1907–8, *July 2*, 943.
  Wheatley School Children, Church Attendance of, *July 6*, 1219.

Russell, Rt. Hon. T. W.—*Vice President of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department* [Tyrone, S.]
- Bureau of Commerce, proposed, *July 8*, 1648.
- Farmers, Co-operation among, *July 7*, 1446.
- Fisheries
  - Cruisers for Protection of, *June 25*, 57.
  - Grant from Department, *June 25*, 56.
- Flour, adulteration of with Talc, *June 29*, 334.
- Forestry, Irish—Case of Mr. Ellison, *June 25*, 57.
- Gooseberry Mildew, Prevention of, *July 8*, 1665.
- "Helga," provision of, *June 25*, 56.
- Irish Trade Statistics, Accuracy of, *June 25*, 58.
- Sheephaven Bay, Trawling in, *June 25*, 58.

Russia
- King's Visit—Matters Discussed.
  Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 958.
- Luxenburg Case
  Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 953.
- Tea Duties—Revision Proposals.
  Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 954.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
- Egypt
  - Cattle Plague, *July 7*, 1461.
  - Liquor Traffic—Compensation Claims, *July 7*, 1462.
  - University Proposals, *July 7*, 1462.
- Foreign Office Vote, Date of Taking, *July 1*, 775.
- India
  - Bengal, Partition of—Local Opinion, *June 29*, 348.
  - Press Act VII. of 1908, Interpretation of, *June 25*, 78.
  - Reform Proposals, Date of Submitting, *June 25*, 114.
  - Simla Scheme, *June 29*, 349.
  - Thakur Bahadur Singh and Thakur Ram Singh, Cases of, *July 1*, 750, 751.
- South-West Suburban Water Bill, 3R., *June 30*, 717–720, 723.
- Turkish Building Operations at Awga, *July 7*, 1461.

Rutherford, Mr. W. H. [Liverpool, W. Derby].
- Mall to Charing Cross Improvement, Information as to, *June 30*, 571, 572.
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., June 30*, 592, 602–604, 612, 685; *July 7*, 1545, 1552, 1559.
- Parliamentary Votes and Proceedings, Form of, *July 1*, 777, 778.

St. Aldwyn, Viscount
- Commons Bill, 2R., *July 2*, 929.
- Land Values (Scotland) Bill, *Rep., July 3*, 922.

St. Bride, [Newport, Mon.]
- School Children Attending Otter-Hunt.
  Qs. Mr. G. Greenwood, Sir I. Herbert, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *July 6*, 1253.

Salisbury, Marquess of
- Endowed Schools (Masters) Bill, 2R., *July 7*, 1420.
- "Grindon Hall," S.S., Preliminary Inquiry into Loss of, *July 6*, 1158.
- Merchant Shipping
  - Desertions in Foreign Ports, 1904–1908—Return, proposed, *June 29*, 311.
  - Discipline, Method of preserving, *June 29*, 313.
  - Foreign System of Pensions, Medical Aid, etc.—Return, *June 29*, 312.
  - Missing Ships, Board of Trade Inquiry in cases of proposed, *July 6*, 1157.

Salisbury Plain
- Small Holdings, Land available for.
  Q. Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1235.

Saltoun, Lord
- Horse Breeding, *July 6*, 1187.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1271–1279.
- Incest Bill, *Con., June 26*, 284.
- Insurance Agents committing Suicide, *July 7*, 1465.
- Polling Arrangements (Parliamentary Boroughs) Bill, *Con., July 3*, 1095.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
- Canadian Tariff Convention with France—Tabling of Correspondence, *June 30*, 568.
- Daylight Saving Bill, Report on, *July 6*, 1248.
- Telephone Mouthpieces, Microbes in, *June 30*, 575, 576; *July 6*, 1251.

Savings Banks
- *See also titles* Post Office Savings Bank, Trustee Savings Bank, etc.
- State-aid, Effect of.
  Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 2*, 944.

Scotland
- *Secretary*—Right Hon. J. Sinclair.
- *Lord Advocate*—Right Hon. T. Shaw.
- *Solicitor-General*—Mr. A. Ure.
- (For particular places, *see their names.*)

Scotland—*cont.*
- Co-operation among Farmers, Expenditure on.
  - *Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 8*, 1641.
- Deer Forests, Limitation of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 1*, 767.
- Estimates, *see under Supply.*
- Medical Officers in Highland Districts.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1662.
- Poor Rate.
  - *Q.* Mr. Younger; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 25*, 54.
- Roads and Bridges, Rate levied for—Return ordered, *July 7*, 1442.
- Western Highlands—Improvement in Technical Education, proposed.
  - *Os.* Sir H. Craik, *June 25*, 174, 175; Mr. Cochrane, 195, 196.

Scott, Mr. A. H. [Ashton-under-Lyne]
- Provincial Homes Investment Company, Ltd., Operations of, *July 1*, 746.
- Sugar
  - Brussels Convention
    - Additional Act, Procedure in ratifying, *July 1*, 775.
    - Bergne, Sir H., Statement by, *June 29*, 355.
  - Russian Export, British Government Attitude towards, *June 25*, 83.

Scott, Sir S. E. [Marylebone, W.]
- Naval Dockyards—Facilities for Men to join Territorial Force, *June 25*, 73.
- Volunteer Permanent Staff Pay under New Scheme, *June 29*, 347.

Sea Fisheries Act, 1868
- Scottish Orders.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1640.

Seaham Harbour Dock Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *June 30*, 494.
- *c.* Lords Amendts., *Con.** *July 6*, 1205.

Sears, Mr. J. E. [Cheltenham]
- Customs and Excise—New Scheme for Excise, *June 25*, 63.
- Taxation, Local, Science Duties, Collection of, *June 25*, 62.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
- *Right Hon. Earl of Crewe.*

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
- *Right Hon. Sir E. Grey.*

Secretary of State for the Home Department
- *Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.*

Secretary of State for India
- *Rt. Hon. Viscount Morley.*

Secretary of State for Scotland
- *Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.*
- Position and Work of Office.
  - *Os.* Mr. Gulland, *June 25*, 117–120; Mr. Pirie, 119–122; Mr. Weir, 123.

Secretary of State for War
- *Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.*

Seddon, Mr. J. W. [Lancashire, S.W., Newton]
- Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 188, 189.

Seely, Colonel—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Liverpool, Abercromby]
- Africa, South—Police Knowledge of Dutch, *July 7*, 1458.
- Australian Commonwealth
  - Harvester Excise Act, *July 6*, 1215.
  - Naval Defence Scheme, *June 29*, 353.
- British Columbia—Coastal Trading by United States Vessels, *June 29*, 354.
- Ceylon Public Works—Employment of Natives, *June 25*, 81, 82.
- Guiana, British—Circular as to Militia, *July 1*, 754.
- Honduras, British—Railway Construction Petition, *July 1*, 753.
- Jamaica—Kingston Improvement Proposals, *June 25*, 81.
- Lagos Railway Lands, Disposal of, *July 2*, 952.
- Madagascar—Indentured Labour for the Transvaal, *July 2*, 951.
- Natal—Trial of Dinizulu, *June 25*, 81; *June 30*, 566.
- Nigeria
  - Northern—Spirit Smuggling, *June 29*, 351.
  - Southern—
    - Fines paid in Gin, *June 29*, 350.
    - Land Alienation, *July 2*, 952.
    - Spirit Traffic, Control of, *June 29*, 350.
- Rhodesia—Asiatic Registration Act, *June 29*, 353.
- Transvaal
  - Boer Migration, *July 6*, 1236, 1237.
  - Chinese Labour—Employment Statistics, *June 29*, 352.
  - Gold Law—Reply received, *July 6*, 1236.
  - Native Labour in Mines—Mortality Statistics, *June 29*, 351, 352; *July 1*, 753.
  - Native Land and Tax Bills, *July 6*, 1237.

[*cont.*

Seely, Colonel—*cont.*
- Tristan d'Acunha, Condition of, *July 2*, 951.
- Uganda Railway—Return as to Expenditure, *July 2*, 944.
- West Indies—Federation Proposals, *June 25*, 80.

Servia
- British Relations with.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *June 25*, 85.

Shackleton, Mr. D. [Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe]
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 645; *July 1*, 828; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1568.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
- Fisheries—Public Rights in Scottish Rivers, *July 1*, 771.
- Vatersay and Barra
  - Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 205–212.
  - Trespass Act of 1865, Application of, *June 25*, 202–205.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork Co., Mid.]
- Ballygibbon—M'Auliffe Case, *July 6*, 1222.
- Evicted Tenants (Ireland) Act, Working of, *June 30*, 560.

Sheehy, Mr. D. [Meath, S.]
- Education
  - National School Teachers' Salaries, Conditions of granting Increase, *July 2*, 1050.
  - Schools—Amalgamation Proposals, *July 2*, 1050.

Sheep Scab
- Salving, Value of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Fullerton; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 25*, 69.

Sheephaven Bay
- Trawling in.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Law, *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 25*, 58.

Sheffield
- Parks—Case of G. H. Fletcher.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *June 25*, 61.

Sheffield, Sir B. [Lincs., Brigg]
- Unemployed Grant, *June 25*, 63.

Sherwell, Mr. A. J. [Huddersfield]
- Notification of Births Act, Towns adopting, *July 7*, 1447.

Shop Hours Act
- Orders under Presented, *June 25*, 4, 51; *July 7*, 1419, 1442.

Simon, Mr. J. A. [Essex, Walthamstow]
- Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1390–1392.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.
Secretary for Scotland [Forfarshire]
- Aberdour Fishery Order, *July 8*, 1640.
- Ayr Prison—Complaint by Warder, *July 1*, 743.
- Balintore Harbour, State of, *July 8*, 1660.
- Banks—Unclaimed Balances, *June 25*, 94, 95.
- Buccleugh Fishery Order, *July 8*, 1640.
- Deer Forests, Limitation of, *July 1*, 767.
- Education (Scotland) Bill—Effect of Amending Clause 9 (1), *June 29*, 372.
- Embo Pier Improvement, *July 1*, 769.
- Estimates, Time allotted to, *July 8*, 1663, 1664.
- Fisheries
  - Board—Fees and Expenses, *July 3*, 1084.
  - Cruiser, *June 25*, 96; *July 2*, 975; *July 8*, 665.
  - Gratuities to Fishermen for Assistance in detecting Illegal Trawling, proposed, *June 25*, 96.
  - Steam-Trawlers, Number of, *June 25*, 95.
  - Trawling
    - Legislative Proposals, *June 25*, 97.
    - Penalties on Foreign Trawlers, *June 25*, 97.
- Glasgow High School for Girls—Pension of Rector, *June 26*, 219.
- Lewis, Island of
  - Farms, Area of, *July 8*, 1634.
  - Migration Scheme, *July 1*, 768; *July 3*, 1085; *July 8*, 1661.
  - Poor Rate, *June 29*, 375.
  - Rate Arrears and Grants, *July 8*, 1660, 1661.
  - Rating *impasse*, *June 25*, 128, 158.
  - Sanitary State, *July 8*, 1660.
  - Stornoway — Report on Sanitation, *July 1*, 767.
  - Upper Bayble School Facilities, *June 25*, 95.
- Local Government Scotland (No. 2) Bill, Legislative Proposals for Replacing, *July 2*, 974.
- Medical Officers in Highland Districts *July 8*, 1663.
- Moray Firth
  - Fisheries, Protection of, *July 1*, 770.
  - Trawling Negotiations, *July 5*, 1258; *July 8*, 1780–1782.
- Old Shoremore Harbour, Improvement of, *July 1*, 769.

[*cont.*

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*

Orkney—Bay of Firth Oyster Beds, *June 29*, 373; *July 1*, 742, 766.

Pilots and Pilotage—Charge against Clyde Pilot, *June 29*, 375; *July 6*, 1258.

Poor Rate, *June 25*, 54.

Port Skerra Pier Improvement, *July 1*, 770.

Sea Fisheries Act, Orders under, *July 8*, 1641.

Sutherland

Education Grant, *July 8*, 1662.

Roads, Maintenance of, *July 1*, 769.

Sween Loch Oyster Fishery, *July 8*, 1639.

Tuberculosis—Scottish Preventive Measures, *June 25*, 98.

Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in, *June 25*, 157–167.

West Loch Tarbert Fishery Order, *July 8*, 1640.

Sligo and Arigna Railway Bill

c. Rep. July 7*, 1439.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]

British Medical Association — Statues on New Building, *June 29*, 325.

Dunfanaghy Labourers Act Inquiry, *June 26*, 221.

Education

Amalgamation Regulations, *July 8*, 1647.

Fuel for Schools, Upkeep and Repairs in 1907–8, *July 8*, 1668.

National School Teachers

Dismissals, Regulations as to, *July 2*, 1043, 1044, 1073.

Salary Increase, Conditions of Granting, *July 2*, 1042, 1045.

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con., July 3*, 1109, 1114, 1118, 1124.

Small Holdings

Credit Banks, Necessity for.
Q. Mr. Bennett; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 368.

Demand for

Method of Ascertaining.
Qs. Mr. Montagu, Mr. Morrell, Mr. J. Collings; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 2*, 969.

Register of.
Qs. Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 369.

Equipment, Provision of.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 369.

House Erection Proposals.
Q. Mr. Bennett; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 368.

Small Holdings—*cont.*

Inquiries, Hour for Holding.
Qs. Mr. Morrell, Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 30*, 580.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 2*, 970.

Land, Difficulty in Obtaining.
Q. Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 367.

Refusals, Appeals against.
Qs. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 368.

Schemes

Acreage Supplied.
Q. Mr. Bennett; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 8*, 1645.

Date for Submitting.
Qs. Mr. Bennett, Mr. Morrell; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 366.

Delay, Prevention of.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 371.

Number Received.
Q. Mr. Bennett; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 367.
Q. Mr. Montagu; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 2*, 968.

Small Holdings Act, 1906

Application of.
Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 7*, 1471.

Small Holdings Acts Consolidation Bill

Date of Introducing.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 26*, 221.

Small Holdings and Allotments Act

Administration of.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey; *June 29*, 370.

Area Permitted to be Acquired.
Q. Mr. Rendall; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 2*, 971.

Co-operative Societies' Profits.
Qs. Mr. Rendall, Mr. J. Collings; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 2*, 971.

Expenses, Payment of.
Qs. Mr. Morrell, Mr. J. Collings, Mr. Montagu; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, Mr. Speaker, *June 30*, 578.
Qs. Mr. J. Collings; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 2*, 970.

Fruit Tres, Supply of.
Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 7*, 1471.

Market Gardeners' Compensation Act, Application of.
Q. Mr. Clough; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 7*, 1471.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]
Korea—Bethell Case, *July 2*, 952, 953.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 591, 606, 686; *July 1*, 836–838, 840.

Smith, Mr. F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1261–1271.
Education Conference at Manchester, *June 25*, 61.

Smythe Estate
Case of Mrs. Riggs.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 66.

Snowden, Mr. P. [Blackburn]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 397, 467, 471.
Sea Fisheries Committees, Grants to, *June 30*, 582.
Unemployment Statistics for May, *July 2*, 966.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devon, Barnstaple]
Old-Age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 411; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1539.
Volunteer Orderly-Room Clerks, Position of, *July 8*, 1654.
Woolfardisworthy Postal Facilities, *July 8*, 1657.

Solicitor-General
Sir S. T. Evans.

Solicitor-General for Ireland
Mr. R. Barry.

Solicitor-General for Scotland
Mr. A. Ure.

Somerset County Council
Small Holdings Committee — Statement by Chairman.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 30*, 581.

Soudan
Abdul Kader, Sentence on.
Qs. Mr. Kettle; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *June 25*, 86.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Bill
c. Rep. July 2*, 931.

Southwell District Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *June 30*, 494.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.* July 6*, 1205.

South-West Suburban Water Bill
c. 3R., *June 30*, 717.
l. 1R.* *July 1*, 729.
2R.* *July 8*, 1593.

Southampton
St. Anne's School, Recognition of.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *June 29*, 365.
Territorial Force Association Poster.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1224.

Spain
Postal Service with Gibraltar—Agreement Presented, *June 25*, 3, 51.
Trade Report Presented *June 25*, 3.

Speaker and Deputy-Speaker—Rulings
Bill moved in Absence of Member in Charge, *July 3*, 1107.
Introduction of Bill under Ten Minutes Rule—Length of Speech, *July 7*, 1484.
Irrelevant Matter, *June 30*, 717.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill
  Amendment in Order, *June 26*, 257.
  Irrelevant Matter, *June 26*, 234.
Old-age Pensions Bill
  Amendments in Order, *July 7*, 1511, 1571, 1572.
  Amendments out of Order, *July 7*, 1554, 1555.
  Cost, Amendments involving Increase in, *July 7*, 1512, 1544, 1564, 1566, 1567, 1587.
  Government Amendments of which Notice had not been given, Propriety of Closuring, *June 30*, 709.
  House having decided that Clause 2 should not be committed, Amendment was out of Order, *July 6*, 1363.
  Irrelevant Matter, *July 6*, 1347, 1354, 1355, 1360.
Questions, *see that title.*
Votes and Proceedings, Form of, *July 1*, 778.

Spies
Legislative Proposals for Dealing with.
Q. Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 8*, 1681.
Object of Foreign Sketching Operations in certain Districts.
Qs. Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Tomkinson; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1230.

Standing Orders
Resolutions Reported from Committee, *June 30*, 557.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
Land Values (Scotland) Bill, *Rep., July 2*, 923.
Nurses Registration Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1203, 1204.
Rates—Compounding System, *June 25* 35.
Roads, Main—Cost of Upkeep, *June 25*, 38.
Taxation, Local — Increased Burdens thrown on Rates, etc., *June 25*, 35.
Valuation—Necessity for dealing with Question, *June 25*, 36–38.

Statues in London
British Medical Association, *see that title.*
Police Report on, proposed.
Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *June 29*, 325.

Statute Law Revision Bill
Joint Committee, *June 25*, 214; *June 29*, 294; *July 1*, 731, 738; *July 2*, 987; *July 6*, 1148.

Staveley-Hill, Mr. H. [Staffordshire, Kingswinford]
Incest Bill, *Con., June 26*, 281.
Law of Distress Amendment Bill, *Con., July 3*, 1103.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con., June 26*, 256.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com., July 1*, 830, 831.
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, *Con. July 3*, 1117.
Sunday Trading—Legislative Proposals, *June 29*, 379.

Steadman, Mr. W. C. (Finsbury, Central)
Post Office Linesmen, Promotion of, *July 3*, 1083.

Stockport Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *June 30*, 494.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 6*, 1205.

"Stowford" S.S.
Crew of.
Q. Mr. J. H. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 7*, 1442.

Strachey, Sir E.—*Treasurer of the Household* [Somersetshire, S.]
Agricultural Holding Acts Consolidation Bill—Date of Introducing, *June 26*, 221.
Bishops Lydeard Small Holdings Inquiry, *June 30*. 580.
Butter, Nut, Description of, *July 8*, 1659.
Butter and Margarine Act, Operation of, in Scotland, *July 7*, 1477.
Cattle
Import Statistics, *June 25*, 60.
Shortage in Supply, *June 25*, 60.

Strachey, Sir E.—*cont.*
Dorchester Small Holdings Inquiries, *June 30*, 577, 578.
Glanders—Disinfection by Rideal-Walker Method, *July 3*, 1085.
Gooseberry Mildew Outbreaks
Cause of, *July 1*, 745.
Number in 1908, *June 25*, 68.
Labour Colonies—Report on Hollesley Bay, *July 2*, 970.
Meat Supply
Beef, Cause for Shortage in, *June 25*, 61.
Inquiry proposed, *June 30*, 583.
Scottish Farmers, Co-operation among, *July 8*, 1641.
Sea Fisheries Committees, Grants to, *June 30*, 582.
Sheep Scab—Value of Salving, *June 25*, 69.
Small Holdings
Co-operative Societies' Profits, *July 2*, 972.
Credit Banks, Necessity for, *June 29*, 368.
Demand for, Register of, *June 29*, 369; *July 2*, 969, 970.
Equipment, Provision of, *June 29*, 370.
House Erection Proposals, *June 29*, 368.
Inquiries, Hour for Holding, *June 30*, 580, 581; *July 2*, 970.
Refusal, Appeals Against, *June 29*, 368, 369.
Schemes
Acreage Supplied, *July 8*, 1645.
Date for Submitting, *June 29*, 367.
Delay, Prevention of, *June 29*, 371.
Number Received, *June 29*, 367; *July 2*, 969.
Small Holdings Act, 1906, Application of, *July 7*, 1471.
Small Holdings Acts Consolidation Bill, Date of Introducing, *June 26*, 221.
Small Holdings and Allotments Act
Administration of, *June 29*, 370.
Area Permitted to be Acquired, *July 2*, 971.
Expenses, Payment of, *June 30*, 578, 579; *July 2*, 971.
Fruit Trees, Supply of, *July 7*, 1471.
Market Gardeners' Compensation Act, Application of, *July 7*, 1471.
Somerset County Council Small Holdings Committee—Statement by Chairman, *June 30*, 581.
Surrey Small Holdings Applications, *June 29*, 335.

Strangford Bar
Whistling Buoy for.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 2*, 984.

Stratford-upon-Avon, &c., Junction Railways (Amalgamation) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 7*, 1439.

Straus, Mr. B. S. [Tower Hamlets, Mile End]
London County Council (Money) Bill, 3R. *June 30*, 716.
Old-age Pensions Bill—Pension Committee, *July 6*, 1219.

Strauss, Mr. E. A. [Berkshire, Abingdon]
Milk Bill, Proposals as to, *June 29*, 363.

Street Traffic
Motors, *see that title.*
Routes of Vehicles, Regulation of.
Q. Mr. Carr-Gomm ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 1*, 756.

Suez Canal
Revenue—Adjustment of Surplus.
Q. Mr. Molteno ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *June 29*, 330.

Sugar
Brussels Convention
Additional Act, Procedure in Ratifying.
Q. Mr. Scott ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 1*, 775.
Bergne, Sir H., Statement by.
Q. Mr. Scott ; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *June 29*, 355.
Cane Sugar Production Statistics.
Q. Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *June 25*, 76.
Refineries, Cost of Supervising.
Q. Mr. Villiers ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 25*, 62.
Russian Export, British Government Attitude towards.
Q. Mr. Scott ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *June 25*, 83.

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill
c. *Con.*, *July 3*, 1106.
3R.* *July 3*, 1126.
l. 1R.* *July 6*, 1149.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]
Alnwick Post Office Drains, *July 1*, 743.
Army Estimates — Date of Taking Clothing Vote, *June 29*, 379.
Erith Unemployed Grant, *July 7*, 1468.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 641 ; *Con.*, *July 7*, 1530.

Sunday Trading
Legislative Proposals
Q. Mr. Staveley-Hill ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 29*, 379.

Superannuation (Post Office and War Office) Act, 1876
Retirement Age.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6*, 1210.
Return under Clause 5.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6*, 1209.

Supply
[*See also titles* Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, Navy Estimates].
Irish Estimates, Time Allotted to.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale ; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 8*, 1681.
Scottish
Opportunity for Discussion.
Qs. Mr. Pirie, *June 25*, 123, 126, 215 ; Mr. Williamson, 215 ; Mr. Barnes, Mr. Morton, Mr. C. E. Price, Mr. J. A. Pease, 216.
Qs. Mr. Barnes, Mr. Sutherland ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 29*, 380.
Q. Mr. Weir ; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 30*, 561.
Qs. Mr. Bryce, Mr. Barnes ; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 1*, 777.
Time Allotted during last Twenty Years.
Qs. Mr. Pirie ; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1663.

Surrey
Small Holdings Applications.
Q. Mr. Brodie ; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *June 29*, 334.

Sutherland, Mr. J. E. [Elgin Burghs]
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to Enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1759–1765.
Scottish Estimates, Time Allotted to, *June 29*, 380.

Sutherlandshire
Education Grant.
Q. Mr. Morton ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1662.
Roads, Maintenance of
Qs. Mr. Morton ; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 1*, 769.

Swansea
King's Dock Fatality on 20th inst.
Q. Mr. J. Ward ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *June 30*, 570.

Sweden
Seamen, Distressed, Relief of—Notes Presented, *July 6*, 1147, 1208.

Sween Loch
Oyster and Mussel Fishery.
Q. Mr. J. D. White ; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1639.

Swinton and Mexbrough Gas Bill
l. *Rep.** *June 26*, 293.
3R.* *July 7*, 1418.

Taff Vale Railway Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 1*, 737.

Taumagh Farm
Cattle-drives in May and June.
Q. Sir G. Fardell ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 335.

Tawe Valley Gas Bill
c. 3R.* *June 25*, 48.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.** *July 2*, 901.

Taxation
Imperial and Local Taxation, Relations between.
Os. Viscount Wolverhampton, *June 25*, 25.
Local
Date of Transfer of Levy of Duties on Licences.
Q. Mr. W. Johnson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 8*, 1643.
Incidence of
Os. Viscount Wolverhampton, *June 25*, 27, 28.
Increased Burdens thrown on Urban and Rural Rates, etc.
Os. Lord Belper, *June 25*, 29–35; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 35; Viscount Midleton, 40–44; Earl of Crewe, 44–47; Earl of Onslow, 47.
Licence Duties, Collection of
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 25*, 62.
Royal Commission Report and Findings.
Os. Viscount Wolverhampton, *June 25*, 25.
Revenue (Collection of Taxes), *see under* Revenue and Expenditure.

Taximeter Cabs
See under Cabs.

Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, S.E., Radcliffe]
Opium, Indo-Chinese Trade, Restriction of Poppy Cultivation, *June 25*, 77.

Tea
Imports in 1907–1908.
Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 7*, 1446.
Russian Duty on Indian and Ceylon Tea, *see under* Russia.

Teachers of Music Registration Bill
c. 1R.* *July 2*, 988.

Teenan's Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 2*, 940.

Telegraph Service
[*See also Names of Places.*]
Boy Messengers, Discharge of.
Q. Mr. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *June 25*, 113.
Reply-paid Unused Forms.
Q. Mr. Cowan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 2*, 942.

Telephone Service
Mouthpieces, Disease Germs in.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *June 29*, 363.
Qs. Sir E. Sassoon, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *June 30*, 575.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6*, 1251.

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Medical Inspection of Children, *July 6*, 1251, 1253.

Territorial Force
See under Army.

Thames
Conservancy, Powers and Position of.
Qs. Mr. Morrell, Mr. Byles, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *July 1*, 757.
Qs. Mr. Morrell; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 7*, 1465.
Places Abutting on—List proposed.
Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *June 29*, 333.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Women's Suffrage Movement — Prison Treatment, *July 6*, 1243.

Thompson (Clonfin) Estate
Sale Proposals.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 29*, 339.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
Army—Territorial Force Enlistments, *July 6*, 1227.
Bristol Post Office Extension—Wages Paid by Contractor, *July 2*, 968.
Insurance Agents Committing Suicide, *July 7*, 1465.
Railway Conveyance of Bicycles, *July 6*, 1247.
Sheffield Parks—Case of G. H. Fletcher, *June 25*, 61.

Tibet
Roads from India, Grant for Improving.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 2*, 949.

Tied Trades
Legislation to deal with Proposed.
Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 30*, 589.

Tobacco
Cultivation, Assistance to.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond, Major Anstruther Gray, Mr. Carlile; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 7*, 1463.
Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 7*, 1479.

[*cont.*

Tobacco—*cont.*
Manufacture Regulations and Licences granted.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 25*, 70.

Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill
c. Con., June 26, 222.
3R.* *June 26*, 233.
l. 1R.* *June 29*, 295.

Tollemache Estate Bill
l. 3R.* *June 25*, 2.
c. 1R.* *June 25*. 50.
2R.* *July 6*, 1205.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
Spies, Rumours as to, *July 6*, 1231.

Trade, Board of
President—Right Hon. W. S. Churchill.
Parliamentary Secretary.—Mr. H. E. Kearley.
Vote, Date of taking.
Qs. Mr. Goulding; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *July 6*, 1259.

Trade Reports
Annual Series Presented, *June 25*, 3, 51; *June 29*, 295, 323; *June 30*, 494, 558; *July 1*, 730, 739; *July 8*, 1594, 1632.
Miscellaneous Series Presented, *July 7*, 1418, 1441.

Tramways
Accidents, Prevention of.
Q. Mr. Harwood; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 6*, 1217.
Speedometers, Use of.
Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 1*, 765.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
l. Rep. June 30*, 493.
Com. July 1*, 730.
Rep. July 2*, 901.
3R.* *July 6*, 1147.
c. 1R.* *July 6*, 1207.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (Potteries, etc., Order) (No. 2) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *June 30*, 493.

Transvaal
Boer Migration.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 6*, 1236.
Chinese Labour—Employment Statistics.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 29*, 352.
Gold Law—Reply received.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 6*, 1236.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Native Labour in Mines—Mortality statistics.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Colonel Seely, *June 29*, 351.
Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 1*, 753.
Native Land and Tax Bills, Provisions of.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 6*, 1237.

Trawling
See under Fisheries, *also title* Moray Firth.

Treasury
First Lord—Right Hon. H. H. Asquith.
Financial Secretary—Mr. C. E. Hobhouse.

Tredennick Estate
Evicted Tenants.
Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 6*, 1212.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorkshire, W.R., Elland]
Weir Charity, Administration of, *June 30*, 584.

Tristan d'Acunha
Condition of.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Colonel Seely, *July 2*, 951.

Troon (Loch Bradan) Water Order Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* *July 2*, 901.
3R.* *July 6*, 1147.
c. 1R.* *July 6*, 1207.
2R.* *July 7*, 1439.

Tuberculosis
Scottish preventive Measures.
Q. Mr. Gulland; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *June 25*, 97.

Tunstall
Woodland Pottery Lead-Poisoning Cases.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 2*, 963.

Turkey
Awga, Building at.
Qs. Dr. Rutherford, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 7*, 1461.
Salonika, State of.
Qs. Mr. G. Gooch, Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *June 30*, 566.

Tyne Improvement Bill
l. 2R.* *June 29*, 293.

Uganda
Railway—Return as to Expenditure.
Q. Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Colonel Seely, *July 2*, 944.

Unclaimed Property
Compulsory Disclosure, Proposed.
Q. Mr. Bottomley, ; *A.* Sir W. Robson, *June 25*, 59.

Unemployed
Grant for.
Q. Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 25*, 63.
Q. Mr. Cox; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *June 29*, 359.
Q. Sir J. Randles; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 6*, 1260.
Officers, Procedure in dismissing.
Qs. Mr. Hay; *As.* Mr. Masterman, *June 25*, 91.
Proposals for dealing with.
Q. Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 6*, 1250.
Statistics for May.
Qs. Mr. Alden, Mr. Snowden; *As.* Mr. Masterman, *July 2*, 965.

United States
Head Tax on British Travellers to.
Q. Mr. Joynson-Hicks; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *July 6*, 1238.
Liquor Licence Duties.
Q. Mr. C. Roberts; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 2*, 958.
Trade Reports Presented, *June 25*, 3; *June 30*, 494; *July 1*, 730; *July 8*, 1594.

Universities
[*See also names of Universities and Colleges.*]
Welsh, grants to.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 2*, 943.

Upton Town Hall Bill
c. *Rep.* June 25*, 49.
Con. June 30*, 556.
3R.* *July 3*, 1081.
l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 6*, 1146.

Urban District Councils (Advertising) Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, and Bill Withdrawn, *July 2*, 1088.

Ure, Mr. A.—*Solicitor-General for Scotland* [Linlithgow]
Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in—Dispute between Lady Cathcart and Cottars, etc., *June 25*, 192.

Valentia, Rt. Hon. Lord [Oxford]
Dorchester, Small Holdings Inquiries, *June 30*, 578.

Valuation
Necessity for Dealing with Question.
Os. Viscount Wolverhampton, *June 25*, 28; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 36–38.

Vatersay and Barra
Condition of Affairs in—Dispute between Lady Gordon Cathcart and Cottars.
Os. Mr. Weir, *June 25*, 124–126; Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, 128–137, 163; Mr. A. Dewar, 138–148, 151–201; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 148–157, 208; Sir J. Dewar, 152, 171–174; Mr. Sinclair, 157–167; Sir H. Craik, 167–171; Mr. Wilkie, 176; Mr. Morton, 177–179, 183; Mr. Ainsworth, 183; Mr. Molteno, 185–187; Major Anstruther-Gray, 187, 190; Mr. Seddon, 188, 189; Mr. A. Bryce, 190–192; Mr. Ure, 192; Mr. Cochrane, 162, 194–202; Mr. T. Shaw, 205–212.
Trespass Act of 1865, Application of.
Os. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, *June 25*, 133, 134; Mr. Cochrane, 194; Mr. T. Shaw, 202,–205.

Verney, Mr. F. W. [Buckinghamshire, N.]
Hop Industry, Import Duties, *June 25*, 70.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 7*, 1496, 1561.

Vickers, Sons & Maxim, Messrs.
Indentures of Apprentices.
Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *June 30*, 589.

"Victoria and Albert" Royal Yacht
Future of.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 1*, 740.

Villiers, Mr. E. A. [Brighton]
Sugar Refineries, cost of Supervising, *June 25*, 62.

Vivisection
Dog Licences taken out by certain Institutions.
Q. Mr E. Griffith; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 2*, 941.

Volunteers
Argyll and Bute Garrison Artillery (1st)—Guns and Officers Uniforms, etc.
Q. Mr. Ainsworth; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 25*, 71.
Long Service Medal, Award of.
Q. Earl of Ronaldshay; *A* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1225.
Q. Mr. Mond; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 7*, 1455.
Orderly-room Clerks—Rank under new scheme.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Acland, *July 8*, 1654.
Permanent Staff Pay under new scheme.
Qs. Sir S. Scott, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *June 29*, 347.

Votes and Proceedings
See under Parliamentary Procedure.

Wales
Church Disestablishment—Legislative Proposals.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *June 29*, 361.
University, Report on
Q. Sir D. B. Jones: *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 8*, 1658.

Walker, Colonel W. H. [Lancashire, S.W., Widnes]
Glanders—Disinfection by Rideal -Walker Method, *July 3*, 1085.

Walker, Mr. H. de R. [Leicestershire, Melton]
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1129.

War Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Secretary—Lord Lucas.
Financial Secretary—Mr. F. D. Acland.
Cloth, Contracts for.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Acland, *July 8*, 1653.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Acland, *July 8*, 1655.
Tartan cloth—Place of Manufacture.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Maj. Anstruther-Gray, Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Mr. Acland, *July 2*, 948.
Coal, Expenditure on.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1232.
Use of Room in, by Mr. Churchill.
Q. Mr. A. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 29*, 348.

War Risks of Shipping
See under Merchant Shipping.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 464.

Wardle, Mr. G. J. [Stockport]
Post Office, Railway Facilities for Employees on Early Duty, *June 25*, 94.
Railway Conference, Position as to, *June 29*, 362.
South-West Suburban Water Bill, 3R., *June 30*, 720–722.
Swansea, King's Dock—Fatality on 20th inst., *June 30*, 570.

Waring, Capt. W. [Banffshire]
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1756–1758.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Stafford, Lichfield]
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1135.
Incest Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 284.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 1*, 807.

Wason, Rt. Hon. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *July 1*, 829.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
House of Commons Police Duties, *June 29*, 364.
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc. *July 8*, 1775–1777.
Motors
Foreign Law and Practice, *July 7*, 1460.
Speed—Applications from Local Authorities, *July 1*, 756.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 7*, 1498.

Waterlow, Mr. D. S. [Islington, N.]
South-Western Suburban Water Bill, 3R., *June 30*, 723–725.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow, College]
Banks
Scottish—Judges as Directors, *July 6*, 1210.
Unclaimed Balances, *June 25*, 94.
Fishery Board Fees and Expenses, *July 3*, 1084.
Glasgow
High School for Girls—Pension of Rector, *June 26*, 219.
Territorial Force Ammunition, Cost of, *June 25*, 64.
Unemployed—Opportunity for Discussion, *July 8*, 1783.
Inverliever Estate, Price of, *July 1*, 743.
Irish Farmers, Co-operation among, *July 7*, 1446.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 233, 240.
Police Constables raised from the Ranks, *July 2*, 963.
Scottish Farmers, Co-operation among, *July 8*, 1641.
Tobacco Manufucture Regulations and Licences granted, *June 25*, 70.
"Victoria and Albert" Royal Yacht, Future of, *July 1*, 740.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under-Lyme]
Lagos Railway Lands, Disposal of, *July 2*, 952.
Nigeria, Southern—Land Alienation, *July 2*, 951, 952.
Northumberland School Site—Westerhope and North Warbottle, *July 2*, 967.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Ballintore Harbour, State of, *July 8*, 1660.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 2*, 987.

[*cont.*

Weir, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
- Fisheries
  - Cruiser, *June 25*, 96.
  - Gratuities to Fishermen for Assistance in detecting Illegal Trawling, proposed, *June 25*, 96.
  - Steam Trawlers, Number of, *June 25*, 95.
  - Trawling
    - Legislative Proposals, *June 25*, 96.
    - Penalties on Foreign Trawlers, *June 25*, 97.
- Lewis, Island of
  - Evictions, *June 25*, 123.
  - Farms, Area of, *July 8*, 1634.
  - Migration Scheme, *July 1*, 767, 768. *July 3*, 1085; *July 8*, 1661.
  - Rate Arrears and Grants, *July 8*, 1660, 1661.
  - Sanitary State, *July 8*, 1660.
  - Stornoway—Report on Sanitation, *July 1*, 766, 767.
  - Upper Bayble School Facilities, *June 25*, 95.
- Medical Officers in Highland Districts, *July 8*, 1662.
- Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to enforcing Three-Mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1778–1780.
- Scottish Estimates, Time allotted to, *June 30*, 561.
- Scottish Deer Forests, Limitation of, *July 1*, 767.
- Secretary of State for Scotland, Position and Work of Office, *June 25*, 123,
- Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 230.
- Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in—Dispute between Lady Cathcart and Cottars, *June 25*, 124–126.
- War Office Contracts for Cloth, *July 8*, 1653.

Weir Charity
- *See under* Charities.

Welsh Church Commission
- Report, Date of issuing.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *June 29*, 360.

West Estate
- Case of P. Kelly.
  - *Q.* Mr. F. Meehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 7*, 1450.

West Indies
- [*For particular Islands, see their names as* Barbados, Jamaica.]
- Federation Proposals.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lamont; *A.* Colonel Seely, *June 25*, 80.

West Loch Tarbert
- Oyster Fishery Order.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 8*, 1639.

Westminster
- Drunkenness Observed during Church Army March on 4th April.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 2*, 961.
  - *Qs.* Mr. H. C. Lea, Mr. C. Roberts, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 6*, 1241.

Wheat and Flour
- Talc, Adulteration of Flour with.
  - *Q.* Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. T. W. Russell, *June 29*, 334.

Wheatley
- Church Attendance of School Children.
  - *Q.* Mr. Morrell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 6*, 1218.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
- Daylight Saving Bill, Facilities for, *July 8*, 1682.
- Fishery Orders for Aberdour and Buccleugh and West Loch Tarbert, *July 8*, 1639, 1640.
- Northumberland School Site between Westerhope and North Warbottle, *June 29*, 362; *July 2*, 966.
- Orkney—Bay of Firth Oyster Beds, *June 29*, 373; *July 1*, 741, 742, 765, 766.
- Population Statistics, *July 3*, 1082.
- Sea Fisheries Act—Scottish Orders, *July 8*, 1640.
- Sween Loch Oyster Fishery, *July 8*, 1639.

White, Sir G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
- Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 29*, 389, 391.

Whiskey
- Royal Commission—Interim Report, *July 8*, 1594, 1631.

Widnes Corporation Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *June 29*, 293.

Wiles, Mr. T. [Islington, S.]
- Old-age Pensions Bill, Friendly Societies Thrift Certificates, *July 2*, 944.
- Post Office, Medical Attendance of Employees, *June 30*, 573.

Wilkie, Mr. A. [Dundee]
- Dundee Postal Staff—Cost of Living, *July 2*, 933.
- Vatersay and Barra, Condition of Affairs in—Dispute between Lady Cathcart and Cottars, etc., *June 25*, 176.

Williams, Mr. A. O. [Merionethshire]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *July 6*, 1288–1290.

Williams Estate
Case of D. Curran.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *June 25*, 67.

Williamson, Mr. A. [Elgin and Nairn]
Fishing Boats, Increase in Size of, *July 8*, 1750.
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to Enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1748–1751.
Supply, Scottish—Opportunity for Discussion, *June 25*, 215.

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 623–625.

Wilson, Mr. A. S. [Yorks., E.R., Holderness]
Cardwell System, Proposals for Modifying, *June 29*, 348.
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1133.
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 263.
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers in—Decision as to Enforcing Three Mile Limit, etc., *July 8*, 1754.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 7*, 1535
Tobacco Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 228.
War Office--Use of Room in by Mr. Churchill, *June 29*, 348.

Wilson, Mr. H. J. [Yorks., W.R., Holmfirth]
"Stowford," s.s., Crew of, *July 7*, 1442.

Wilson, Mr. J. H. [Middlesbrough]
Antwerp—Shipping Fee System, *June 29*, 324.
Merchant Seamen, Discharged— Accommodation on Passage Home, *June 25*, 52.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Con.*, *July 7*, 1532.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]
Aden Guard Ship, *June 25*, 74.
Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 601; *Recom.*, *July 6*, 1396.

Wilson, Mr. P. W. [St. Pancras, S.]
Civil Service Boy Clerks, *July 6*, 1255.

Wilson. Mr. W. T. [Lancashire, S.E., Westhoughton]
Bristol Telegraph Office Vacancies, *July 1*, 740.
Chatham Dockyard Store—Joiners' Work done by Labourers, *July 7*, 1452.
Old-age Pensions Bill—Disqualification Provisions, *July 7*, 1449.

Winfrey, Mr. R. [Norfolk, S.W.]
Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 242, 243, 270, 273.

Wireless Telegraphy
Tapping of Messages.
Qs. Mr. Hay; *As.* Mr. Lambert, *July 2*, 945.

Wishaw Burgh Electricity, etc., Bill
*l. Rep.** *June 30*, 493.

Wolverhampton Corporation Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 7*, 1417.

Wolverhampton, Viscount
Local Authorities' Debt, Increase in, *June 25*, 26.
Poor Law Reform, Necessity for, *June 25*, 29.
Taxation
  Imperial and Local Taxation, Relations between, *June 25*, 25.
  Local
    Incidence of, *June 25*, 27, 28.
    Royal Commission Report and Findings, *June 25*, 25.
Valuation—Necessity for dealing with Question, *June 25*, 28.

Women's Suffrage Movement
Police Employed on 30th ult., Cost of, etc.
Q. Major Renton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 2*, 961.
Treatment accorded to Arrested Persons.
Qs. Sir J. Brunner, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 1*, 757.
Qs. Mr. Hay, Mr. Healy, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *July 2*, 958.
Qs. Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Morrell, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 6*, 1243.

Wood, Mr. T. McK.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
Education ~~C~~onference at Manchester, *June 25*, 61.
Education (Local Authorities) Bill, *Con.*, *July 3*, 1126, 1133, 1139, 1140, 1143.

Woods, Forests and Land Revenue
Report Presented, *June 30*, 495, 558.

Woolfardisworthy
Postal Facilities.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 8*, 1657.

Woolwich Arsenal
Ansell, W. E., Case of.
Q. Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 25*, 72.

[*cont.*

Woolwich Arsenal—*cont.*

Boys Employed.
Q. Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 25*, 66

Discharges in 1908.
Qs. Mr. Fell, Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1228.

Reynolds, J., Case of.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 6*, 1229.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S. [Sheffield, Hallam]

Old-age Pensions Bill, *Com.*, *June 30*, 623.

Wye Fisheries Provisional Order Confirmation Bill

c. Rep. July 8*, 1630.

Yeomanry

Enlistment in Territorial Force.
Q. Mr. Guinness; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *June 25*, 66.

Netheravon School, Abolition of.
Os. Lord Lovat, *July 8*, 1613; Lord Lucas, 1622.

Pay of Officers Transferred to Territorial Force.
Os. Lord Harris, *July 8*, 1617, 1618, 1625, 1629; Lord Lucas, 1625, 1626; Viscount Midleton, 1627, 1628.

Yeomanry—*cont.*

Squadron Drill Pay, Abolition of.
Os. Lord Harris, *July 8*, 1619, 1629; Lord Lucas, 1626, 1629.

Training and Drill Regulations.
Os. Lord Harris, *July 8*, 1617, 1620, 1621; Lord Lucas, 1627; Lord Lovat, 1629.

Younger, Mr. G. [Ayr Burghs]

Banks—Unclaimed Balances, *June 25*, 95.

Lewis, Island of

Poor Rate, *June 29*, 375.

Rating *impasse*, *June 25*, 127.

Licensing Bill—Application to Ninety-Nine Year Leases, *July 7*, 1478, 1479.

Local Authorities (Admission of the Press) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 236.

Scottish Poor Rate, *June 25*, 54.

Tobacco-Growing (Scotland) Bill, *Con.*, *June 26*, 230.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]

Education—Teachers' Preliminary Examination Results, *July 8*, 1641.

Zanzibar and Pemba

Trade Report Presented, *July 8*, 1594.

Zouche of Haryngworth, Lord

Rates—Evils of Compounding System, *June 25*, 39.